JAN 13 1986

GP 3.30: 985/2/v.1

ORIGINAL

COMPLETED

255

MEETING OF THE
DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL
TO THE PUBLIC PRINTER

HASSE HALL
Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C.

Wednesday, October 16, 1985
Volume I

The meeting of the Council was called to order by the Chairman at 9:00 o'clock, a.m.

Diversified Reporting Services, Inc.
1511 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 808
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005
(202) 628-2121

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Jennie B. Cross, Chairman

Diane H. Smith, Chair-elect

Marian Carroll, Secretary

Mildred Mason
Barratt Wilkins
Sandra McAninch (absent)
Susan E. Tulis
James R. Veatch, Jr.
Robert A. Walter
Kathleen Eisenbeis
Clyde W. Hordusky
Rosamond Jacob
Margaret M. Prudden
Hans Raum
Bruce Morton

I N D E X

Page

Welcome and Remarks
by Jennie Cross 4

Greetings and Remarks
by Mr. Jennifer, Public Printer Representative 6

Observations/Overview
by Donald Fossedal, Superintendent of Documents 16

Recommendations/Spring 1985 Meeting 49
- Number 1 50
- Number 2 52
- Number 3 52
- Number 4 56
- Number 5 61
- Number 6 70
- Number 7 70
- Number 8 86
- Number 9 113
- Number 10 119
- Number 11 132
- Number 12 133
- Number 13 137
- Number 14 140
- Number 15 143

Committee-of-the-Whole/Open Forum
by Diane Smith 144

Statement of Carolyn C. Jamison
Pennsylvania State University 145

Statement of Kathleen Eisenbeis
Re: Map Depository Program 191

Statement of Frank Ousley
U.S. Geological Survey 192

PROCEEDINGS

WELCOME AND REMARKS

MS. CROSS: Good morning. I call the meeting of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer to order, and we have a nice gavel with which to do that.

I am Jennie Cross, Chair of the Depository Library Council. Welcome back to the GPO after quite an absence. The very first meetings of the Council in the early '70s were held here and this is the first time that we have been back to this spot for our meetings in about, I would guess, 13 plus years

I would like the Council members to briefly introduce themselves even though their names are out. Would you please, Mildred, start?

MS. MASON: I am Mildred Mason with OSSI.

MR. HORDUSKY: Clyde Hordusky, State Library of Ohio.

MS. EISENBEIS: Kathleen Eisenbeis, University of Texas, Austin.

MR. WALTER: Robert Walter, Pittsburg State University, Pittsburg, Kansas.

MS. CARROLL: Marian Carroll, Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois.

MR. MORTON: Bruce Morton, Montana State University.

MS. SMITH: Diane Smith, Pennsylvania State University.

MR. WILKINS: Barratt Wilkins, State Library of Florida.

MS. TULIS: Susan Tulis, University of Virginia, Law Library.

MR. RAUM: Hans Raum, Middlebury College.

MS. JACOB: Rosamond Jacob, St. Paul Public Library, St. Paul, Minnesota.

MR. VEATCH: Jim Veatch, Nashville Tech, Nashville, Tennessee.

MS. PRUDDEN: Peggy Prudden, Montgomery County Public Libraries, Montgomery County, Maryland.

MS. CROSS: Thank you. There are certain staff people from GPO in the audience and they will be introduced later, but I would like to recognize one former GPO employee and that is Mae Collins who is here. I think all of you or many of you will remember her. She was the Chief of the Library Division and she has been responsible for writing a Classification Manual which is very close to being distributed far and wide. So, Mae, it is nice to see you back again.

In the absence of Mr. Kennickell this morning, we are pleased to have the Deputy Public Printer with us, Mr. Joe Jennifer. He is a career GPO employee who has an extensive craft and managerial background. He began his Federal career at GPO in 1954 and from 1978 to the present he has served in a series of key positions in GPO, most notably as a Superintendent of the Electronic Photocomposition Division , Deputy Production Manager, Acting Production Manager, Assistant Public Printer for Planning, Executive Advisor to the Public Printer, and Assistant Public Printer, Operations, prior to being appointed to his current position as Deputy Public Printer.

It gives me great pleasure to introduce Mr. Jennifer.

GREETINGS AND REMARKS

MR. JENNIFER: Thank you very much.

On behalf of the Government Printing Office, I wish to welcome the Depository Library Council members, visiting librarians, and others assembled here to this Fall 1985 meeting of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer. That is a mouthful in itself.

I am particularly pleased to convene this session of the Council in this attractive meeting hall which became a part of the Library Program Services this past February, when

LPS moved its operations from Alexandria, Virginia.

Now, to give credit where credit is due, I would like to personally thank Ms. Bernadine Hoduski and Mr. Tom Kleis, who is the Staff Director of the Joint Committee on Printing, for providing this space. I was talking a minute ago about the history of it and how the Architect of the Capitol happened to be touring through here. This originally was an old locker room for our hot metal workers downstairs.

If you take the time sometime today, look at the before and after pictures up there. It shows you really what it was like. It makes me feel good to think that this space is being dedicated to your programs.

Let me say just a bit more about the relocation of LPS to Main GPO. Now that LPS has been here for eight months, Don Fossedal and Mark Scully assure me that the LPS relocation was a good decision and has resulted in improvements for the LPS operations, staff morale and the coordination of other key GPO offices herein.

The success of the LPS relocation has also given us encouragement as we work toward bringing other GPO satellite operations into the main plant. We see this centralizing trend in GPO as one that combined the benefits of cost savings and improved operational efficiency with other very important bonuses.

The preference we find of most of our employees is to work here in the Central Office, and hopefully, by bringing as many of the operations back into the central plant, we are accomplishing that and improving employee morale in the process.

I know that to many of your veterans of the Depository Library Program mine is really not a familiar face at your meetings even though I did attend last year. I know you are used to seeing people like Bill Barrett and, more recently, Don Fossedal -- and I can remember back, let's see -- Mike DiMario was with you a couple of years. But although I have not been that visible or active in your programs in the past, I want you to know that I hold the Depository Library Program in very high regard. I am very interested in its continued success.

Also, since my past GPO career has primarily been in production and in planning, and other non-documents area, I have not really been a central player in your activities until now. In my new role as Deputy Public Printer, I look forward to becoming more directly involved in documents work and the

Depository Library Program. I know I can learn quite a great deal from you about librarianship and depository activities.

At the same time, I hope to share with you my experience and background in printing, program planning and information technology. Let me just say that you can count on me as an enthusiastic and supportive part in all areas of the Depository Library Program.

I guess I am apologetic to a point, again, about being a newcomer here. I do take some comfort, though, in knowing that I am not the only new kid on the block here with you this morning. In fact, it is my distinct pleasure to congratulate and welcome five newly-appointed members to the Depository Library Council, who are beginning their three-year terms of office today.

These five depository librarians have been selected from among their professional peers to advise the Public Printer on matters pertaining to Depository Library Program.

They have traveled to Washington from several areas throughout the country -- and I believe one is even local -- to join us all this week. Let me recognize each of them individually, by name: Ms. Kathleen Eisenbeis, who serves as Documents Librarian at the Perry-Castaneda Library of the University of Texas at Austin; Mr. Clyde Hordusky is a Regional Depository Librarian with the State Library of Ohio; Ms. Rosamond Jacob is a Government Publications Librarian at the St. Paul Library in St. Paul, Minnesota; Ms. Peggy Prudden -- she did not have very far to come this morning since she works just a few miles north of us, that is Montgomery County Public Library in Rockville, Maryland, where she holds the position of Government Documents Librarian; Mr. Hans Raum comes to us from the Egbert Starr Library at Middlebury College in Middlebury, Vermont, where he serves as Associate Librarian.

I want to thank these five librarians and the other 10 Council members who have agreed to serve their profession and the American public as members of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer.

Few depository librarians have the opportunity to affect information policy directions as profoundly as you will. We, at GPO, solicit your counsel and your cooperation in addressing the many issues that lie before us. With your guidance and feedback, GPO can stay on target in fulfilling the public's ever-evolving need for better information products and services.

Lest anyone think that the Depository Library Council is our only involvement with the library and information community, I would mention that many of our GPO staff in the Superintendent of Documents area are actively involved in a variety of professional and information-related associations. Our own Don Fossedal, Superintendent of Documents, is a member of the Virginia Library Association, as well as a GPO representative to the Federal Library and Information Center Committee at the Library of Congress.

Not too long ago I had the opportunity of speaking to an organization by the name of IRAC. I was pleased to hear a familiar GPO name, and that was Mark Scully, our Library Programs Director, who was recently elected a General Member of the Information Resources Administration Council, which is a cross-disciplinary information organization affiliated with the U.S. Department of Agriculture Graduate School. Mark, congratulations.

In addition, we are represented in the American Library Association, the Special Libraries Association, the Medical Library Association, and the District of Columbia Library Association. I know that Don Fossedal, who you all know as a marketing person, appreciates the value of maintaining contact with this client community. He encourages his staff to give this kind of participation a high priority. I think Don is to be commended for this practice.

Now, people in Library Program Services tell me that some of you have come here to find out what GPO has been doing about updating the Monthly Catalog from their tapes, I believe from 1976, forward. Now, I am not a librarian, but I do know enough about the Federal procurement system to tell you that its procedures are very firm, they are formal. Unfortunately, they are often very slow.

What I am saying to you is that I have some good news for you and some bad news. Let's go with the bad news first. That is, that the appropriations process and the procurement system will take more time and maybe be more involved than any of us, or you, might have really thought.

Now, the good news is that just last week GPO published a formal notice in the Commerce Business Daily inviting prospective contract bidders to meet and discuss the requirements. So, as you can see, we are moving ahead to update the tapes in accordance with the Federal procurement guidelines.

Having said that much, I will leave it to Don

Fossedal and Mark Scully to provide more detailed information on this subject throughout the course of your stay here in GPO.

A little earlier I alluded to one of my subject specialties of a sort, or I should say one of the areas -- I do not want to say I am specialist of anything; you get trapped that way -- but one of my areas of interest and probably one of my former areas of responsibility, and that was information technology. This really is a real continued interest of mine. In fact, I can remember when GPO's Depository Library Program went on the OCLC System. I think that was about 10 years ago. A few of the people out there in Virginia, I had the opportunity to meet about that time.

I was enthused over getting OCLC and I am just as enthused today over our current LPS systems applications.

At your Albuquerque meeting last March, the Public Printer, Ralph Kennickell -- and I want to bring up a point here; he is awfully sorry that he was not able to be here this morning with you, but he has been recently on the road and I understand he is going to be with you tomorrow morning -- but the Public Printer announced at that meeting that soon the LPS lighted bin system would come on-line and that computer-controlled lights would show our workers which depository libraries were to receive which documents.

Well, in May of this year, that new lighted bin system went into operation and it has already improved both the productivity and the accuracy of our distribution operation.

Next on the drawing board is the design for an automated system to manage the acquisition and classification of depository publications. Our plan is to proceed function by function toward full integrated automation of the Library Programs Service.

Over the course of this three-day meeting, you will be hearing about some of the very exciting technological applications that will predict things to come in our information society. Some of these applications include optical disk publishing, you will hear people reference electronic transfer of information to libraries, and all of the things that I know you are all interested in seeing happen in our community.

Personally, I cannot imagine a better time than right now for librarian and information professionals. Never has change been so rapid, nor challenge and opportunity so great.

I am pleased to have a part in the Depository Library Program. I look forward to working with you to develop and improve this important public service.

I guess you have heard enough of me and I know you have a very full agenda ahead of you, but I would like to wish you all the greatest success here at your conference and if there is anything that we can further do to help you, please let us know.

Thank you very much and good luck to all of you.

(Applause.)

MS. CROSS: Thank you very much, Mr. Jennifer.

There is one announcement that I would like to make out of sequence. I am going to later on make several announcements. But in this room there will be no smoking. So I assume that there are areas outside that, if you wish to go and smoke, you may.

When the Council was introduced, one Council member was absent. That is Sandra McAninch. For those of you who might not know, Sandra had a little daughter early this fall or late this summer -- I am trying to remember what day she was born on -- her name is Kelly Grace. That is the reason that she is not with us today. So we will miss Sandy.

Our next speaker is our Superintendent of Documents, the admiral, Don Fossedal.

OBSERVATIONS/OVERVIEW

MR. FOSSEDAL: I am Don Fossedal, the Superintendent of Documents. I sincerely want to welcome everyone. I also want to thank Mr. Jennifer for kicking off our meeting here. I want to reiterate what he said, the Public Printer did want to be here; in fact, he cut his trip short so that he can make it tomorrow.

I do not have too much to say. I am going to let the record speak for itself. We have had a fantastic six months since our great meeting in Albuquerque. Rather than dwell on all of the things we have accomplished, I am just going to go over them quickly and give you a little review, because they will be covered in much greater detail later.

The first thing I want to do is -- Mr. Jennifer introduced the five new members of the Depository Library Council -- I did want to give you a little, just a quick update on the rationale for their selection. In looking over past membership, I detected a certain lack of balance, so I thought this time I would recommend people for Council, for the Public Printer's approval, that would redress some of this balance.

For openers, there were 19 states that have never had a member on Council. We have taken care of that to a degree this year by appointing members from Vermont, Maryland, and Minnesota. There were certain segments of the depository library community which were grossly under-represented, one of those being the college library designation, and then to a lesser degree, but still under-represented, the public libraries segment.

So we have added, I think, one college and three public libraries, if I remember. It depends how you count Clyde Hordusky, if the state library is public or academic. I do not know. I have a hard time keeping track of all 1,400 of them.

But in any event, we tried to redress some of that. We also thought that it was a good time to appoint a map librarian because of our new involvement in maps in the Depository Program, so that is how we got Kathleen.

But that is just basically the rationale behind our selection. That will continue in the future, until we bring some, I think, better balance and make sure that areas of the country, that perhaps have not been as active in Council

-- perhaps maybe they are a small library and cannot afford to send them to many of the meetings -- but I want to make sure that they are represented in these higher councils. So that will be the rationale.

I will just quickly mention some of our accomplishments. You have all heard of the -- I think it was the May 15th OMB Circular. Working with JCP and OMB -- and Bernadine will cover this later -- we did work out a program where OMB will be the -- let's call it the enforcement arm on the executive agencies to provide depository copies to the Depository Library Program. There should be less -- what do we call them -- fugitive documents in the future.

What they asked us to do was to develop guidelines for use by the executive agencies to know, for sure, which documents and publications should be included in the program. Bernadine, Mark, Barbara Appel, and myself worked on developing these guidelines, and Bernadine will discuss them tomorrow. In fact, I think Mark is having copies made of the draft guidelines and will be distributed either this afternoon or tomorrow morning for your review.

In the last year, in addition to what has been a pretty successful marketing program, which Charlie McKeown will describe later, in addition to that, I think a tremendous grass-roots campaign is beginning to be developed. I have seen evidence of this in Tennessee, in Indiana -- well, Barbara Smith, at Skidmore, up at Saratoga Springs, put together a program this year in which she invited librarians from all over that part of New York State. And it might be even a majority of them there were not even depository librarians, is that fair to say? It was an excellent program. I wish you would take the opportunity to speak to her during these Council sessions as to how successful they were.

In addition, I and several members of the staff have attended many of the regional of local library association meetings around the country during the year. To name a few, I was in Indiana, went down to Charlottesville for a documents day at the University of Virginia a few months ago, that Susan Tulis put on. It was excellent.

I went out to the One Hundredth Anniversary -- eight years late, incidentally -- at Illinois State in Normal. It was great. I met the President and Senator Simon's aide. It was very successful and I think we brought some good credit to the Depository Program in that beautiful library at Normal.

On the way to Saratoga and that great day, I stopped off in Albany and visited the New York State Library and saw their great program, and had a real good opportunity to discuss some of the technical aspects of the new technology with the experts at Albany.

I am going to Mississippi next Thursday and Friday to speak to the Mississippi Library Association. I went out to Tennessee and substituting for the Public Printer with Dr. Veatch, and presented about 10 certificates to depository libraries in the Memphis area.

I taught the FLICC course at the Department of Agriculture Graduate School.

So I think that we are trying to outreach here from Washington and I think you are responding very well. In fact, you might even have seen some of the things in Administrative Notes that Mary Lee O'Brien has been coordinating, as to what some of the libraries have been doing out there. That is really the secret in the final analysis. We can only do so much here in Washington, but the more that you are able to pick up on these things and generate your own, again, grass-roots programs, I think you are going to really help the overall Depository Program.

Another thing we accomplished again this time -- and the Council seems to like it -- is we got all of the recommendations, all fifteen answered except one, and that was Number 8. We were negotiating with the attorneys and the Library of Congress. We have 8 now, but we got the other fourteen out long before Council, so that they had time to deliberate. I think they are also in Admin Notes before Council, so you did not walk in here the morning of Council and have to study fifteen resolutions and try to figure out where you are. So we are proud of that.

The Traveling Display piece, that we mentioned in Albuquerque, Charlie will mention it tomorrow in the marketing update. He will not be able to show it to you, only pictures, because it is out in (Nelinet) right now, in the Boston area, in use. But we are going to have four or five more made, so you are going to have available to you five or six display pieces that you can again use in your own grass-roots campaigns.

We had it out at IFLA. I was even able to put it up in about four minutes. So you will probably be able to do it in two. But we did put it up and it worked, I think, quite well.

Mark, do you have the -- hold up a couple of our posters -- Charlie will go into this more tomorrow, but I did want to show you and remind you, you probably received them, or many of them.

This poster is a generic poster to promote the catalog. We would like to have it in government agency buildings. We would like to get it in grocery stores and in libraries. This would be for use in a library where you do not have a book store in the immediate vicinity.

We have a second version. This promotes the catalog, but you get it through a local book store. So if you happen to be in Detroit, Fran, you can put one of these up in Detroit Public. We will imprint, on the bottom, the location of the Detroit bookstore. So if you can get those all up around Detroit or Cleveland or New York or Kansas City, wherever you might happen to have a bookstore, it will help the synergy that I am looking for between the Sales Program and the Depository Library Program.

With the new lighted bin system that you heard so much about -- I hope not ad nauseam -- we have been doing some statistical studies and find that we have cut our error rate at least in half; where we had a 4 percent, now it might be less than four, it is probably less than two.

At the same time that we have halved our error rate, we have doubled or tripled our claims. That gives one pause to wonder how we can have more claims when we have less errors, and it is something that I am going to be looking into very seriously and very closely before somebody else looks into it for me.

(Laughter.)

So if you are making erroneous claims, please really make sure that you do not order something that you have already received, because if you do, it really cheats people, particularly those on the West Coast, that if you make a mistake and claim something that you should not have, some library gets deprived. So do your best in making sure your claims are correct.

In Albuquerque, I mentioned a long-range plan. I am glad I did, because I just read Sarah Kadec's article and she said we needed a long-range plan. So I beat her with the acknowledgement of its need. We started it about two months ago. It is made up of Mark Scully, head of Library Programs Service; myself, Mike Bright, my program analyst; Bernadine, from the Joint Committee on Printing; Tony Harvey, who is a technical expert up on the Senate Rules Committee and on the

Joint Committee on the Library.

Then, we have Irene Ringwood, Printing and House Administration, an attorney; and we have the House side represented. And then Hilary Lieber, Clerk of the Joint Committee on the Library -- and I believe she is an attorney -- okay, whatever. But we have a very good cross section of librarians, lawyers, House, Senate. I have learned a little bit in the last three years, about it is better to get these things all onboard first, so that you do not develop a plan that later has some little flaw in it and you have wasted a year.

We meet every week for a couple hours. We took a field trip a couple weeks ago and visited Johns Hopkins University and Enoch Pratt Library in Baltimore. I am also encouraging members that work at LPS, at least Mark, to have our people go out and work in the depository, so they know what it is like on your end, just as we are trying to improve the workshops, so that you know some of the things that go on, on our end.

But this long-range plan is going to be difficult to write. We want a small, hard-working group that meets on a regular basis, everything is written up, and we discuss it.

In six months, nine months, when we have more hard data or more hard copy, we will probably be coming to Council or various members of the library community and asking for specific help on specific subject areas.

The tape update, Joe mentioned. We did just what we said we would. We did a statement of work. We reviewed it with our Oversight Committee. We went to the Commerce Business Daily last Thursday. I have just been told the meeting is going to be November 14th. Let me read you what it said in the Commerce Business Daily -- it is short -- in case you missed it.

"Library Data Technical Processing Services. The Government Printing Office is considering issuing solicitation for library data technical processing services to verify, update and/or correct an estimated 200,000 machine-readable cataloging records in MARC format. These records cover U.S. Government documents listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications since the July '76 issue. The Statement of Work will primarily require the vendor to verify, update, and/or establish name and series headings and authority records, MARC field tags, subject headings, serial and collective records, and other bibliographic record content.

"The nature of the work will involve a mixture of professional and technical library cataloging services and computer processing of bibliographic records. All firms having the capability and interest in performing these services are invited to attend a formal briefing at the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

"Attendees at these meetings will be invited to bid on this requirement should a solicitation materialize. This announcement is not intended to obligate the Government in any manner, nor will any contract be awarded solely on the basis of this Notice."

So we have taken the next step.

Then, as you know, we will have to get appropriations approval.

I attended IFLA, spoke at a program there of librarians from all around the world and in the technical area, gave my slide presentation on marketing. I am happy to say it went over very well. In fact, two of the librarians, I think from Kenya, visited Washington and spent some more time, again part of our outreach even internationally.

The Blow Back Program, that we mentioned at

Albuquerque, will be covered later by Jay Young. He has put together a position paper or a fact sheet on where the Blow Back Project stands, and I will have him address it because he is much more conversant with it than I am.

Like I said, I worked in the depository for a day. Jim Gillespie even let me help check in some books. I was happy to note that he said that when they make a mistake and do not get something that they would have liked to have, they do not claim it, because he said they have a deposit account at the Sales Program. So Jim had the right answer.

I am going to go out and visit a couple libraries with Inspectors. I want to learn a little more about the Inspection Program. You may not like this, but I see these reports coming through all the time, and I see all these Outstandings and Excellents. It surprises me that there are that many Outstandings and Excellents when I hear how bad the program is sometimes. So I am going to go out and see if there are this many Outstandings and Excellents, and if there aren't, it is going to be tougher to get them. If there are, then we will continue that way.

In short, I just might tighten the screws a little bit on the Inspection Program, because I just do not believe that there are that many outstanding, because Outstandings are usually the top 1 percent.

So I will be going out. That is good news and bad news. I am getting involved in your areas.

The map depositories, Charlie McKeown will talk more about the public service announcements that we have developed. I have received three wonderful love letters already from map depository librarians about how much they like the map library public service announcements. Kathleen wrote me a letter, but I have not seen it yet, so I do not know if she likes them or not, but she told me I have a letter coming. Since she is our expert on maps on the Council, I will wait. She might get up and say she does not like them. Anyway, I have gotten some love letters already.

If any of you are map depositories, I think you have a good opportunity to let your community know that you are able to provide that service to them.

I will be around for the next two-and-a-half days. If you have any problems, I am very accessible, very easy to talk to, so just come up. The Patent and Trademark office already nailed me this morning. Please stop by and say what is on your minds.

That is all I have. Thank you and have a good conference.

(Applause.)

MS. CROSS: Next is Mark Scully, who is the Director of the Library Programs Service. Mark, we are anxious to hear what you have to say.

A lot of you were here yesterday at the workshop and you have had a chance to see the new area. I think those of you who saw Alexandria, and now see where the LPS is situated, can all say that we are pleased that the staff has more space and it is nice to be here.

LPS UPDATE

MR. SCULLY: This is indeed a special day for the Library Programs Service to host this meeting of the Depository Library Council in our new offices. When I found out that even the State of Alaska would be represented here by Mr. Alden Rollins of the University of Alaska at Anchorage, I was reminded of a memorable childhood lesson that has served me well through the years.

Back when I was growing up in New Jersey, my family had a neighbor named Jim Beatty, who would venture to Alaska every year on a big game hunting expedition after bear, mountain goat, and the like. The films that Jim would later show us of his encounter, with fierce, rampaging, 600-pound bears, were both fascinating and terrifying to his home audience in suburban New Jersey.

After seeing one of his films, I distinctly remember asking Jim what would he do if he found himself confronted with a ferocious charging bear and his gun were to jam up. "Well," said Jim, "in that case, I would just drop my gun and walk toward the bear."

Asked to explain the startling response, Jim replied laconically, "That way it saves both me and the bear a whole lot of trouble."

(Laughter.)

So this morning I intend to be candid and forthcoming in addressing a number of issues and concerns of the Library Programs Service in order to save us all a whole lot of trouble at a later time during the question and answer period.

Ever since the LPS moved to this building, we have been making steady incremental progress in every functional area. Take a few minutes to read our special issue of Administrative Notes, Volume 6, Number 16 -- I hope there are enough to go around; in any case, it is being distributed to all depositories in the shipments -- which lists updates on 14 areas of interest to depository librarians. From my point of view, these progress updates represent elements of the management strategy to bring every LPS function, such as acquisitions, cataloging, distribution, inspections, and so forth, up to an adequate level of control, taking us beyond the point where we were constantly preoccupied with backlogs, shortages, error corrections in our work.

To the extent that LPS is able to maintain the necessary resource levels, and concentrate its energies exclusively on depository production activities, I see continued progress in all these areas.

But beyond performing its basic production functions, LPS is limited to what it can accomplish. Creative alternative approaches must be considered for carrying out other projects, such as identifying rare documents, cataloging monographic series, updating Monthly Catalog tapes, and improving basic competencies of depository library workers.

Now, these are all worthy projects, but they cannot be added to the LPS production workload without adversely affecting the delivery of basic depository products and services. I should explain here what I mean by the term "depository production activities." In addition to day-to-day performance of acquisitions, classification, micrographics, cataloging, distribution, publishing, and all of our depository network coordination activities, we devote a great deal of energy to monitoring and improving our methods of performing these functions.

Our special issue of Administrative Notes is replete with examples of efforts we have been making to tighten quality control,improve our products, and expand our services. We intend to continue in this direction, arresting fugitive documents at the earliest point, stemming the tide of depository shortages that result in those infernal rainchecks, and developing the ACSIS system that will give us positive control over the very difficult acquisitions and classification processes.

Believe me, these problems vex us every bit as much as they do you and we are committed to solving them. All of our depository libraries can help us solve these problems in several concrete ways: First, by following the guidelines set out in Instructions to Depository Libraries, by claiming only publications that were preselected, and by returning item selection printouts and surveys on time, and so forth;

Second, by using the Depository Library Inquiry Form #3794 rather than a business letter or a telephone call for technical matters wherever possible. The amount of time that LPS supervisors spend handling inquiries from 1,389 libraries is substantial, and your using the LPS inquiry form simplifies and expedites the process;.

Third, by understanding the fact that LPS is basically organized as a production shop and that major projects added without commensurate resources have the effect of retarding our production capability. Where possible, therefore, Council should consider library volunteer and cooperative approaches for undertaking major projects not directly related to the LPS mission.

Now, if I were asked to assess the condition of the Library Programs Service at this point, I could honestly say that the future looks bright. LPS is now located with the GPO support offices that order our documents, develop our computer systems, and provide personnel and procurement services. This past summer, a GPO Interoffice Task Force was assembled to address the problem of depository shortages and overages.

Several key recommendations of that task force will be implemented before the end of November. This kind of progress would have been unthinkable were LPS still located in Alexandria, Virginia. To address the fugitive documents problem, GPO is coordinating with the Office of Management and Budget to require executive agencies to submit more of their publications for depository distribution. Now, Don has already alluded to and given more detail on that particular point.

Bernadine Hoduski, of the Joint Committee on Printing, is now preparing, and in fact has completed, the guidelines to help Federal agencies better understand what kinds of publications do and do not go into the Depository Program. That is essential to the success of this OMB-GPO effort, to make it clear to the agencies exactly what this program is about and what we expect them to submit for depository distribution, and as opposed to the "wet paint" signs of local internal administrative use that should not be submitted.

MS. HODUSKI: Mark, tell them it is just preliminary, not completed.

MR. SCULLY: All right. It is still in a draft preliminary form, but the fact is that she has -- that is, Bernadine -- has laid it out on paper and defined it. It still needs to be fine-tuned, but there it is and it is a fine job.

Also, in the Systems and Technology area, we are on the upswing. In addition to the lighted bin system, we have a microfiche duplicator running claims copies now, a word processor typing our letters, a new offset press printing our shipping lists, and two state-of-the-art telefacsimile machines ready to link LPS with the GPO Regional Printing Procurement Offices across the country.

Even more importantly, we are hiring qualified people to fill long-standing vacancies. We now have a full complement of inspectors and by the end of the year, a total of 21 catalogers will be onboard. Also, by the end of the year, I expect to have a Library Division Chief in place.

Overall, LPS is putting its internal house in order, while working with other GPO offices to reduce shortages and rainchecks. At the same time, new initiatives have begun with OMB to get more publications into the Depository Program.

Please support our efforts by allowing LPS to concentrate its resources on solving these chronic problems and developing the automated systems needed to control our work. Frankly, all the new grand projects in the world won't mean much unless we are able to set a good basic foundation for depository library operations, and we are working hard at that.

In closing, let me say that we need your advice and counsel, but we also need the latitude and flexibility to do what needs to be done in Washington here, to improve the program at the front end. If we are successful, depository libraries will see expanded levels of document coverage and depository service.

(Applause.)

MR. SCULLY: Jennie has asked me to introduce a number of the staff members of the Library Programs Service who are present in the room, if I can pick them out. They might want to stand and make it easier for me.

Joe McClane, our Chief Inspector. Earl Lewter, back in the corner. Earl, would you like to raise your hand? Earl Lewter is in the Depository Administration Branch.

Mr. Parker Covington, Chief of the Depository Distribution Division. John Tate has been with the Library Programs Service for a number of years as a classifier, and was just recently, about a month ago, selected to join the Inspection Team. John handles all of the inquiries from

Congress and from libraries themselves on depository designations and other changes in statutes concerning depository libraries.

Sally McLean heads up the Classification and Cataloging Branch. Carla Spence, back there, is the head of our Micrographic Section in Depository Administration.

Colleen Davis is the person who fulfills all those claims that you send in. Jorge Ponce, in the back. Jorge is the Section Chief in our Classification and Cataloging area, and Jorge's area of expertise is in the serials, and contins, as they call them here, our expert serials librarian and cataloger.

Sheila McGarr, I see in the back. Many of you know Sheila. She has paid your libraries a visit, I am certain, and done an inspection on your library.

Quynh Hoa, who is a new depository library inspector, who has only been with us about -- well, less than a month, and pretty soon you will be ready for your solo inspection, Quynh? All right.

Joe Paskoski, I see over there. Joe is also a relatively new inspector. How long have you been with us, Joe?

MR. PASKOSKI: For three months.

MR. SCULLY: All right. And Marian MacGilvray, in the back. Now, Marian has been with the Library Programs Service, as head of the Cataloging Section One, for a number of years.

I am sure that through the course of the two and a half day program, you will be seeing different LPS faces showing up here at the various sessions, because I have asked each of the supervisors in the program to give all of the employees, every LPS employee, some exposure to the proceedings of this Council, so they can see -- and frankly, many of them are not aware of the great interest and dependency that the library community, and indeed the American public -- have on the work they do, and I want to make that clear, that their work is very important and this is one good way for them to see it in person.

MS. CROSS: Thank you, Mark. It is good to see so many GPO people here. We are glad to have you with us today.

I will get it out of my system. I have to tell jokes. I heard Mrs. Bush speak last Monday, over in Ann Arbor, and she was telling a story, although I understand after she told it, she told it incorrectly. So I will give the correct version of it, not the Bush version.

But anyway, Mrs. Bush told -- we have heard about the good news and the bad news -- well, I have a bad news/worse news story, a gentleman had gone to his doctor for tests and had gone back to hear the results. When he went in, the doctor told him that he had some bad news and some worse news. The fellow said, "Okay, tell me the bad news."

The doctor said, "You only have 48 hours to live." The fellow was just really taken aback. He said, "What could be worse than that?" The doctor said, "I forgot to tell you yesterday."

(Laughter.)

Let me start out with a few announcements. I have already mentioned about the no smoking. That is the bad news. For some of us it is good news. This did not get on the agenda, but on Friday afternoon, at 1:30, there will be a tour at the Library of Congress, of the Optical Disk System. If you notice, on the agenda, there is a presentation by an individual from the Library of Congress about the Optical Disk System. I thought it might be worthwhile to also see it, as well as hear about it.

If you would like to go, please sign up. There is supposed to be a place to sign up over here on the table. So we can tell the folks at the Library of Congress how many are coming. They can handle 45 people. It will take an hour. They will break us up into groups of 15. If more than 45 of you want to go, they will do a second one, at 2:30. So please sign up so that we can call them as soon as possible and let them know how many wish to have the tour.

This evening, all of you are invited to a reception at the Hyatt Regency in the Capital Room between 6:00 and 7:30. This is a reception that is being hosted by Brodart and it will give us all an opportunity to visit and see each other when we maybe do not have time to do that in-between our meeting sessions.

Some good news, or bad news, however you want to look at it -- some birthdays. Mr. Kennickell's birthday is coming up next week, on the 21st. I understand he will be all of 40 years old. Don Fossedal's birthday is coming up on the 26th. I do not know how old Don is. And Diane's twins had a birthday yesterday. They were three years old. So I think it has been a little hard on Diane to be away from her family at this very important time. We hope that their daddy is surviving.

If you notice, there are floor mikes. If you wish, when there comes the time to speak, please use one of the microphones, so that what you are saying can be recorded, and at the same time, give your name and your institution, so that that also may be recorded. If you do not wish to speak before the group, if you are uncomfortable, there are these blue cards over on the table which you may get. We will be happy to receive any of your comments or questions that you wish to write down in place of stating something.

Also, yesterday, I understand some people had asked about getting a copy of Sheila McGarr's speech. There is also a tablet at the table to sign if you do wish a copy of that.

I would like to know if there are those present who have not seen a copy of the recommendations and the responses. All of you have gotten a copy, so there is no problem when we do discuss it later -- okay, that is good to know.

This is something that we usually do at most of our meetings, and that is identify ourselves in terms of who we are, what type of libraries we are from. I would like to know, are there those present who are attending their first Council meeting?

(Show of hands.)

MS. CROSS: A sizable group. Welcome. I am glad that you could come and we hope that you can attend future meetings.

How many former Council members are in the audience?

(Show of hands.)

MS. CROSS: I see several of those. I think nearly everyone is a former Chair. It is nice to see all of you back.

How many academic libraries are represented?

(Show of hands.)

MS. CROSS: Good portion.

Diane suggested to indicate college versus university. How many universities are here?

(Show of hands.)

MS. CROSS: A big number.

All right. College?

(Show of hands.)

MS. CROSS: Thank you.

Public libraries?

(Show of hands.)

MS. CROSS: Okay.

School libraries?

(Show of hands.)

MS. CROSS: Sort of.

State libraries?

(Show of hands.)

MS. CROSS: Okay.

Federal libraries?

(Show of hands.)

MS. CROSS: We see some of our Federal colleagues here.

Other special libraries or libraries that don't fit in those categories?

(Show of hands.)

MS. CROSS: Well, we have three of those.

How many here are living east of the Mississippi?

(Show of hands.)

MS. CROSS: Wow. Okay.

West of the Mississippi?

(Show of hands.)

MS. CROSS: We still get a lot of people. Good.

You want to consider yourselves from the South?

(Show of hands.)

MS. CROSS: Okay. And the North?

(Show of hands.)

MS. CROSS: Okay. We will just divide up the country here.

How many from the District of Columbia?

(Show of hands.)

MS. CROSS: Okay. Not as many.

And regional depositories, how many of you are here?

(Show of hands.)

MS. CROSS: Oh, a lot. Great.

I would like, to begin, to thank the GPO staff who were so helpful to me in getting the agenda and the related activities of this Council together. Thank you, Don Fossedal, Mark Scully, Dave Brown, whom some of you maybe have already met, and I had hoped that he could be introduced this morning, but he is away for awhile. Maybe this afternoon we will have a chance to introduce him.

There are others behind the scenes, I am sure, who I do not know about, who assisted the Council. Several people have duplicated things for me. Marian MacGilvray this morning did a whole bunch and I appreciate that very much. It has been very helpful.

I want to tell you that I have had an ongoing love affair with government documents for almost 20 years, and to have been appointed to this Council is an honor to me. However, with privilege comes responsibility, and I think that all of the Council members would agree with me that our responsibility is great.

The Depository Library Council has accomplished a lot in its decade plus. Many of the guides and the manuals that are utilized today are the result of Council's support and input. The Council's role is no less diminished today. In fact, looking ahead at rapidly changing technology and the impact of often dwindling resources, our task is great and decisions are becoming more difficult.

Publications and processes that we have become accustomed to may have to change. We can be philosophical and admit that there is nothing permanent except change, or we can be dragged, kicking and screaming, into the next phase. I would hope that there could be some compromise along the way.

The enormous amount of printed material that flows through the depository system, in both paper and fiche, cannot continue indefinitely. What Regional can receive on a daily basis as much as is being shipped now, and add that to what is already there, on a never-ending basis?

Information is important, but how long do we have before this dormant volcano, that we are sitting on, finally explodes, and we are attempting to shore up walls that are collapsing about us? We must think about ways to deliver documents to the people without burying ourselves in the process.

This is an important time in GPO's history as they are looking toward their 125th Anniversary. GPO has gone through some traumatic changes in their recent past. What was once a hot metal typesetting plant now has modern photocomposition capabilities. As a GPO employee explained yesterday, the relatively small room holding 10,000 computer tapes would have to be a whole floor at GPO if they were still using hot metal.

The journeyman typesetter is now sitting at a computer CRT. Change -- Mr. Jennifer mentioned change in his remarks. Information managers are already delivering services in nontraditional formats, such as videodisks, videotapes, and electronic full-text retrieval.

The optical disk, with its tremendous storage capacity, is being used, but unfortunately, the industry, in efforts to compete and to be first, are not developing uniformity, which to me, is like not being able to read microfiche in any other reader than the one made by the company which developed the particular fiche.

It is my hope during this meeting that we can be somewhat visionary in our approach to matters at hand, as well as practical. It is also my desire that you, who have joined us for these few days, will share your expertise with us.

I have already mentioned, in our new format, in meeting as a Council, we invite you to jot down any question or comment on one of the cards at your seat -- well, I thought it would be at your seat, but they are on the table -- if you feel uncomfortable speaking before the entire group. The audience will have many opportunities for input.

In the afternoon open forum session today, which I have asked Diane Smith to chair, we will be covering bibliographic issues and access problems revolving around the Monthly Catalog. By the way, when did we start saying "MOCAT?" I do not like that. Some time will be spent on the distribution of maps to depository libraries, as well as potential legal issues and administrative issues.

A few changes have been made on the agenda. On Thursday, unfortunately, Pat Reeling cannot be with us to speak about the Educational Task Force. Either Mr. Fossedal or Mark Scully will be making some remarks about that and bringing us up-to-date on the Educational Task Force.

We have also invited Carol Becker, who is Assistant to the Historian at the Department of State, (that puts out the Foreign Relations of the United States) and she will be telling us about a new slip case that has been designed to hold microfiche, so that the fiche can sit on the shelf by the hard copy that it supplements.

There is one other change in the OMB presentation tomorrow. Timothy Sprehe will not be able to be here and Katie Lewin will be speaking in his place. I think we will have a very good discussion of the OMB Circular and work that has been done on that since last we met.

Mr. Zurkowski also will not be here. David Peyton is coming in his place.

Also, tomorrow morning, Mr. Kennickell will be joining us at the very beginning rather than in mid-morning, as is on the agenda.

The other thing that is really not too different, we will be adjourning tomorrow afternoon at 4:30, and the Council will be meeting to write our recommendations. We do not care if you want to sit and watch us tear our hair. You may come. We would just ask that you do not participate. But we will be meeting in the Hayden Room.

One nice thing about -- those of you who are former Council members and remember the recent past -- guess what, folks, I don't have to type the Recommendations. There is support here at the GPO to do that this evening, and for that I am very grateful.

I think we are through a little early. Mark, would you like to start on the Recommendations, or would you like to take a break now and then begin?

All right. Let's have a brief break about 15 minutes and then we will get started on the Recommendations.

Thank you.

(A short recess was taken.)

MS. CROSS: Are we ready to begin? This is really a happy group this morning. I know you are just so glad to see each other. We do need to get started in order to allow some discussion time.

RECOMMENDATIONS/SPRING 1985 MEETING

MS. CROSS: In this section of the agenda, Mark Scully and I are going to be doing the dog and pony show on the spring '85 meeting Recommendations. I am going to read the recommendation. Mark is going to summarize or respond in full, however he sees fit, and then we will ask the Council for any input, any comments, any questions. Then, we will allow the audience time, if you wish, to have comments or questions.

We will do it recommendation by recommendation rather than going through the whole thing and then coming back.

So we will begin with the first recommendation. I think most of you know that Dan MacGilvray, who for a number of years was our logistics person, organizer, pulling-things-together-person for these Council meetings, and he was given a new position in GPO, as the GPO Historian. If you are on the 8th floor and outside of the Public Printer's office, there are some display cases that he has mounted with some material from the past, some very interesting letters, and some memorabilia that you might like to look at.

But, anyway, we were thanking Dan for his years of service to the Council and wished him well.

Do you want to respond, Mark?

MR. SCULLY: To which?

MS. CROSS: To the Number 1, Dan's promotion or new assignment, however you want to put it.

MR. SCULLY: We should have Dan MacGilvray here. It is actually a very personal message, I think, from the Council to Dan MacGilvray. But I will try.

The new GPO Historian, Dan MacGilvray, accepts with thanks the congratulations of the Depository Library Council. He considers it a great privilege to have worked with such dedicated people over the past nine years.

Thanks is also expressed by the newly-married GPO Historian and his wife, Marian, for the delightful wedding present so thoughtfully provided by Council members.

I see Marian over in the corner. Marian, you can't get away that easily. Please stand. Marian MacGilvray.

(Applause.)

MS. CROSS: Just a little side note. Marian and Dan's wedding invitation was one of the most unusual I had ever seen and very lovely. The colors were different. It was in a little chapel in Pennsylvania, evidently a very old, historical type building/church, and they asked you to not bring rice, but birdseed. I think that it was evidently a very delightful occasion. Congratulations.

The second recommendation, again, was one of our thank-you's. We thanked the Public Printer, the Superintendent of Documents, and the Director and Staff of LPS for their efforts in providing more timely information and superior accommodations for the meeting that was held in Albuquerque. We appreciate their support in assisting us to carry out our revised meeting format, and it was a big help.

MR. SCULLY: The Public Printer and his staff were delighted over the acknowledged success of the Spring '85 Council meeting and are gratified to have the thanks of the Depository Library Council for GPO's efforts in providing advanced information and superior accommodations.

MS. CROSS: Any comments from the Council, questions?

(No response.)

MS. CROSS: Does anyone in the audience wish to speak?

(No response.)

MS. CROSS: We will go on to Recommendation 3.

Given the urgency of the issue of updating the GPO tapes, the Depository Library Council recommends that GPO proceed as quickly as possible with its plans to develop specifications for, and fund, a contract to revise and update its retrospective cataloging records in accordance with the attached proposal.

MR. SCULLY: Our formal response that has been published to that recommendation is dated at this point. It is a fast-moving issue. In fact, you have heard more about it this morning that you probably care to hear from all of us. Essentially, I will reiterate what Mr. Fossedal primarily said, and Mr. Jennifer, mentioning the fact that the announcement and invitation to a meeting has been formally published in the Commerce Business Daily issue of last Thursday, October 10th.

Mr. Fossedal read this. Prospective bidders and interested parties will assemble -- I believe the date is set for November 14th here at GPO -- and will proceed from there. Otherwise, the basic information in the Council recommendation is accurate, but we have come a little bit beyond that from its publication. But that is the latest status on the tape update.

MS. CROSS: Let me insert here that when we did these recommendations last spring, we also wrote rationales, and it was the Council's intent that the rationales be published. That did not happen, and we have mentioned this in conversation to Mark. So this fall section, after the recommendations are made, the Council will write rationales. That then will be published in Administrative Notes, so that those who were not present at the meetings, did not hear the discussion, will know some background about the recommendation, and those will be published in the future.

So you may not have seen any copies, but we did add to these some rationales.

Council? Yes, Jim.

DR. VEATCH: Mark, I wanted to ask about this last sentence here, about the appropriation from Congress. We are to assume that before a contract is let, that there will be a request for appropriations for the entire project from Congress, is that right?

MR. SCULLY: Some source of funding needs to be identified and secured. As to the exact procedure for doing that, I think we are at an early point. The effort now is to fully identify the nature and the scope and the cost of the work effort to fulfill the requirements under this contract.

Once that is identified, then you are in a better position to pin a dollar figure on it, and then seek funding. Now, whether that is to officially and directly seek an appropriation, or to reallocate funds already appropriated, or to go to some other party and seek it, whatever, I am not sure what the tack will be at that point. Right now our job is to identify the precise nature of the work, the steps involved, and the costs of implementing those steps.

MS. CROSS: Diane?

MS. SMITH: Mark, you mentioned a work statement in the recommendation or the resolution, the answer to the recommendation. Is that available for us to see, the work statement?

MR. SCULLY: There is a work statement, as we mentioned here. It was prepared very, very quickly and thoroughly by Marian MacGilvray of our staff, primarily. Some others had input, but Marian is primarily the author of that work statement. She did a superb job at it.

It is an internal GPO document. It has to do with a potential procurement, and those of you who are familiar with government procurement regulations know that those things are kept under wraps in order that every potential bidder is provided the same information and treated in the same way equally across the board.

So, no, to make a long story short, that is not available for release at this time, but I am sure that those kinds of things, that information will be presented in some fashion and discussed at the November 14th meeting for prospective bidders.

MS. CROSS: Any other Council members, any comments?

(No response.)

MS. CROSS: Would anyone in the audience like to speak?

(No response.)

MS. CROSS: We will go on to Number 4. Council recommends that GPO commit itself to playing a leading role in addressing the problem of government document statistics. Council recommends that GPO convene a meeting to be attended by groups which have a vested interest in the collection of such statistics, for example, the National Center for Educational Statistics, the American Library Association, the Association of College and Research Libraries, the Library Administration and Management Association, the Government Documents Roundtable, the Joint Committee on Printing, the Association of Research Libraries, the American Association of Law Libraries, et cetera, to discuss definition standardization and reporting of government document statistics.

MR. SCULLY: Due to the complexity of the subject, the number of interested parties, an apparent lack of consensus among these parties, and considering the time frame for the 1987 Biennial Survey, it is felt that a meeting or a series of meetings of all interested parties, as recommended by Council, would not lend itself to a timely agreement on statistics.

GPO has met with those groups that have a vested interest in the collection of government document statistics. These interested parties have been asked for their comments as to the type, method, and definitions to be used in the 1987 Biennial Survey. They have also been asked to develop some draft survey questions.

Final development of the Biennial Survey will commence as soon as GPO has gathered their responses. At the request of GODORT's Statistical Task Force, the time period for comments has been extended until the mid-winter meeting of ALA in January 1986.

GPO is committed to using the Biennial Survey as a principal means of gathering information from depository libraries. The final decision on which statistics to collect will be part of the development of the 1987 Biennial Survey.

MS. CROSS: All right. Council? Kathleen.

MS. EISENBEIS: I have a question about who those with a vested interest are and if they are the ones that are listed here, or could you share with us who they are.

MR. SCULLY: Joe, I am going to have to ask you for some enlightenment on this. To my understanding, the organizations listed in the resolution are the ones we are referring to. Joe, are there any outside of that, or would you like to elaborate?

MR. McCLANE: Joe McClane, GPO. We have taken Council's advice and contacted one way or the other -- some we could only contact by phone or letter -- all the organizations that Council recommended we contact. If there are any others that express an interest, we will contact them, too.

MS. EISENBEIS: I am concerned about the "et cetera" on the end of the list and wondering if -- don't you have any idea?

MR. McCLANE: Well, we have sent out, I am not exactly sure how many letters and phone calls, et cetera, we made. There were about eight or nine we did. If there were any other organizations that we could think of, we have certainly tried to contact them and get their input.

MR. SCULLY: Let me say something. Joe made it a particular point, at the ALA summer meeting in Chicago, to talk with a number of people informally out there about this. Now, that is additional to the formal requests, letters of request that we have sent out. So that might be what the "et cetera" refers to.

MR. FOSSEDAL: You might want to consider taking out the "et cetera."

MR. SCULLY: Thank you. That might clarify it.

MS. CROSS: Any other Council? Okay. Lois.

MS. MILLS; Western Illinois University: The "et cetera" in my copy is part of the Council's question, not part of the answer, so it really does not apply as far as I can see.

MS. CROSS: Don, when you speak again, would you go to a microphone. She said it is a little hard to hear even though I know you have a strong voice. We want to make sure we get all of this on the record.

MR. FOSSEDAL: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Any further comments? Yes.

A PARTICIPANT: Ruth Smith from NTIS. I would like to ask if Special Libraries Association was included in the invitation to participate.

MR. SCULLY: Ruth, the SLA was not notified, and as a member of SLA, I stand here embarrassed. So I will personally see that the SLA is solicited for their input.

MS. CROSS: Any other comments, either Council or audience?

(No response.)

MS. CROSS: Just a comment. Joe, you sent out a report manipulating some statistics from the Biennial Survey. One of the responses was about the number of users in a depository, of a depository library, and I remember you saying something about guesstimates. Is there anything being done to help these depositories be more specific, that their statistics will be more reliable and they won't be just guesstimates?

I know most institutions, unless you have a door guard or you have some electronic device, you can't really count the people coming and going, but sometimes there are other ways of doing it in statistical gathering. I was just wondering if you are doing something to move in that direction since this Biennial Survey is going to be very important.

MR. McCLANE: A user survey is probably the hardest statistic to gather, with the prevalence of selective housing and other things, but we are looking into things like sampling and other methods of trying to at least ascertain much more accurate user survey than this was. This is just really an approximation so we would have some idea. But certainly the way our question is framed, and certainly the methodology of collecting the information, we could get much more accurate statistics on that Question Number 18.

MS. CROSS: Thank you. Any other comments before we move on?

(No response.)

MS. CROSS: Recommendation Number 5. Council recommends that GPO present to Council at its fall 1985 meeting a status report about the planning for the 1987 Biennial Survey.

MR. SCULLY: Although the planning for the 1987 Biennial Survey was only initiated late last summer, certain fundamental principles have already been established.

One, the survey will take place during spring 1987. Two, answers will be encoded on optical scannable response sheets by the libraries. This will minimize manual handling.

Three, software will be created which will allow for cross-tabulation of responses. Fourth, future surveys will not vary significantly from the 1987 survey, allowing for a comparison of surveys over a length of time.

Five, sampling conversion tables, a glossary of terms, and concise directions will be employed to minimize the workload on the libraries and to facilitate statistical gathering.

Given the tremendous diversity in size, scope, and functions among depository libraries, the survey instrument needs to be as flexible and as user-friendly as possible. In analyzing the results of past surveys, it was found that when questions are asked which many libraries find difficult to answer, survey responses received tend to be of little utility. Some decisions have already been made as to the content of the survey. The survey will consist of an answer sheet, a self-addressed return envelope, and a questionnaire.

The questionnaire will be divided into three sections. Section 1 will contain the first eight questions of the 1985 survey, and the information gathered from these questions will be used for the committee print and GPO records.

Section 2 will contain approximately six questions of particular usefulness for the Inspection Team, access, facilities, et cetera.

Section 3 will contain approximately five statistical questions. This last group of questions can be cross-tabulated to yield a number of different statistics and, hopefully, an accurate profile of the depository library system.

Since Council has offered to help with the planning for the 1987 Biennial Survey, GPO would like to suggest that Council appoint a representative to review the proposed statistical packages being submitted by various interested parties for inclusion in Section 3 of the 1987 Biennial Survey. This representative could then make a recommendation to GPO before the 1986 spring meeting of Council.

MS. CROSS: Council?

MS. SMITH: Mark, one of the things that you plan to do, that is, to have the encoding done by the libraries, as a standard sort of surveying technique, that is not generally recommended because people have a hard time filling in the little white and black dots. Is it possible that those 1,400 sheets could be done at LPS to decrease the error rate?

MR. SCULLY: If I read what you are saying, you are making the point that it might be a mistake for GPO to receive a machine-scannable survey return, worksheet returned, rather than something that is simply eye-readable.

MS. SMITH: Right. Have somebody here translate the answer, the little machine-readable part.

MR. SCULLY: Joe, have we considered that, receiving an optically scannable, that we considered simply an eye scannable, and do the transcription here?

MR. McCLANE: Well, maybe it is just because we have just gone through the '85 and faced with 1,400 sheets that my inspectors and I had to go through and do by hand, we thought it would be much easier -- it would be a whole lot easier for the Inspection Team, small as we are, to have this information already there. Then, we could just plug it into, hopefully, the appropriate software and shoot it off to the various people who needed it; for instance, Congressional Printing Management, and the other areas of GPO that need this information too.

MS. SMITH: I understand your concern that there will be a certain percentage that won't go through because people have done it wrong. It is decreasing the statistical reliability of it, and I just question 1,400 surveys, how long would it take. That might be something to consider.

MR. SCULLY: Well, we have an idea of how long it would take because we just did it. Of course, the 1987 survey will be a more lengthy survey. But at this point, let me say that we will consider that as a technical concern, the validity of the sample or of the survey relative to receiving an eye-readable or a machine-readable return from the libraries. That seems to me is a kind of a technical question that we would want to address to a professional survey person, statistician, let's say.

MS. CROSS: Bob?

MR. WALTER: Will there be an effort to pretest the definitions and the questions over a wide sample of depository libraries, so we do not run into the same type of problems we ran into before?

MR. SCULLY: Another good suggestion. I do not know if we have thought about that, Joe, have we?

MR. McCLANE: Yes, we have thought about that. That is something we definitely want to do.

MR. SCULLY: All right. As you can see, Joe has been on top of this and spending a great deal of time. He went to

ALA in Chicago and discussed it with a number of people out there. He has made the formal requests for input to the professional associations. He has done other things. So he is out front of all of us on this one, I think.

MS. CROSS: Marian?

MS. CARROLL: On these optical scannable forms, I understand the reason for it and I am very sympathetic with it. My only problem is that when we do the same sort of things for surveys, that we do not always get the items that we have selected. Somehow they are dropped from these optical scannable forms. So that is another problem.

Is there any way to ensure against that happening?

MR. McCLANE: There might be. I would really have to study that.

MR. SCULLY: Let me say this. You are right. We have had problems in the past with optically scanning survey returns and those kinds of things. I think that that is more an indictment of the particular machine or the process, that I hope we have fixed or made advances on fixing, rather than the concept or the basic approach.

In other words, if you have got a good machine, it will work. If you have got a broken machine, it won't work.

But the concept is not invalid because of a bad machine.

MS. CROSS: Yes.

MS. JACOB: I would think one thing you could do -- I do not know if anybody can hear me -- is look over. I mean say you have got a machine scannable thing, and have some human being look them over to see if anybody has written in the margins. I mean I always am doing that. You are going to have some forms that people are not going to get, so you may have to code an occasional one yourself.

MR. SCULLY: That is a good point also. Many irregularities, errors or other irregularities, or misunderstandings on the part of the respondents can be determined by simply glancing at it. If they, as you say, write in the margin or mark a column that is not there, those kinds of things can happen, and we will do an optical review, an eyeball review of each sheet to detect those kinds of obvious errors or irregularities.

MS. JACOB: The other thing is if you have got a sampling system, be sure to remember the very small libraries. I mean if you are a one-person library, and you are sampling one day, you know, that does not mean much. I think for a large library -- I do not know enough about statistics -- but

I know that you have got to have a different system by the size of libraries.

MS. CROSS: Bruce?

MR. MORTON: Mark, are we to presume from Item Number 4 here, future surveys will not vary, et cetera, that GPO is going to change its current policy and retain in machine-readable form the data from the biennial surveys?

MR. SCULLY: Yes. We are going to retain the machine-readable. We were caught in a time crunch, frankly, this past go-around, and we put together a brief, 18-question survey that frankly worked pretty well, we thought, for our purposes. Now, I understand there are other purposes and that is why we are consulting with you folks and the other professional associations, to have their input and their suggestions as to what useful statistical data might be.

But the 1985 Biennial Survey serves our purposes. It identifies libraries that are having problems. It tells us that in fact people are using -- members of the public are using depository libraries. It tells us some other basic information that are very valuable for us here, for a number of purposes, in GPO.

But, yes, we do intend to go to a machine-readable survey next time.

MR. MORTON: Let me reclarify what I am asking. I am asking if you are going to retain the data in machine-readable form, so you can run longitudinal studies. In the past, it is my understanding the GPO has erased, in essence, machine-readable data after it has published the survey.

MR. SCULLY: Yes, we make reference -- we don't use the particular terminology "longitudinal studies over time" -- but that is exactly what we are driving toward here, to establish a very good, very well structured survey for 1987 and then retain that essential structure with only minor changes in future years, so that these longitudinal studies through time can be done.

We do intend to keep that data. It takes a lot of cost and effort to gather it and it doesn't make much sense to destroy it, so we do intend to do that.

MS. CROSS: Any further comments from Council?

(No response.)

MS. CROSS: Does anyone in the audience wish to speak? Questions, comments?

(No response.)

MS. CROSS: We will take your recommendation under advisement.

Six and seven, GPO has sort of grouped together, so I will read both of them.

"Recommendation 6. The Council recommends that separate item numbers be established for reprints and preprints of GPO publications. The policy of providing separate item numbers for these materials would save selective depositories high overhead costs of processing and housing and would save GPO the costs of printing and distributing unselected publications."

"Recommendation 7. The Council requests that the Superintendent of Documents reconsider the position that articles reprinted from previously distributed depository publications are separate publications. Declaration that reprints are publications which may be handled as superseded documents would allow more flexibility to selective and regional depositories.

MR. SCULLY: Council Recommendation 6 and 7 address the issue of reprints which are defined as journal articles and other re-issued excerpts from government publications that have already been distributed to depositories.

The Superintendent of Documents has analyzed this issue and considered several possible solutions, each of which has certain costs and implications for service.

There are three basic concerns that a viable solution must satisfy. First, many depository libraries find these reprints useful, so a blanket policy to discontinue their distribution should be avoided. Second, the regional and selective depositories need relief from the burden of processing and housing unneeded reprints.

Third, the dollar and labor costs to GPO, of establishing item numbers for reprints, would be substantial, especially during this time of limited budget and staffing levels. Moreover, this option would provide no relief to the regional depositories.

Recommendation 7 offers a good practical approach in terms of handling reprints as superseded documents. Following this approach, GPO will continue to classify the reprints, list them in Monthly Catalog, and distribute them under existing item numbers. However, depository librarians will now have the flexibility to handle reprints in the way that is best suited to local library operations and user needs.

For example, reprints may be routed for current awareness purposes, entered into a vertical file, or simply treated as superseded documents. Depositories are not obliged to maintain a shelf list catalog or to otherwise keep records on superseded documents.

During the summer of 1986, LPS expects to have available the services of a graduate student on loan, who will study this issue in depth and prepare a report with recommendations. Until this report is ready, however, this approach should greatly alleviate the reprint problem for both regional and selective depositories.

MS. CROSS: Council? Diane?

MS. SMITH: I thank the Superintendent of Documents and I know my library assistant thanks the Superintendent of Documents for this decision.

(Applause.)

MS. SMITH: But I also have a question. This is really Sandy McAninch's question. I am representing Sandy since she is not here, as well.

Why are we going to study this issue further if this is a good solution is the question? You are hoping to get an intern in the summer.

MR. FOSSEDAL: Excuse me here when I use some of this library jargon incorrectly, but, Mark, if you will cover the point that we have discussed with Bernadine, about those documents which are not necessarily superseded, but we would want the libraries to receive them -- do you remember from agencies that are not necessarily in a reprint mode, do you remember we talked about that in my office?

MR. SCULLY: Yes, yes. That is a funny word, "reprints." It means a lot of things to different people and that is why I defined it in beginning my response to the resolution.

There are cases -- now, correct me if I am wrong and chime in, if you would, Bernadine -- there are cases where a government publication, U.S. Government document, will contain a reprint from a commercially published document or a privately published document, so that is another case of a reprint. But in that instance, it would not have previously been distributed to depositories.

Am I getting it right, Bernadine? Go ahead. It gets very involved.

MS. HODUSKI: No. We are concerned about those things that are published in commercial or nonprofit scholarly journals, that are articles by government employees, that you will get those and they are not going to be in a government journal, although they may be in another journal that you have. So we do not want those treated the same way. That is what needs to be studied. I will say a little bit about that in my presentation Thursday, about what we are doing on those kind of reprints and which agencies are involved in our pilot project we are working on.

MR. SCULLY: Thank you. Well, I think, in general, what we tried to do here is to give you some immediate first aid on this problem. We know that your walls are bursting with these materials. We wanted to get you off the hook with something immediate, and that is what I think we have done.

But the issue, as we have indicated, is very complex. It merits further study and we will get that study next summer. But at least now you are off the hook and you are able to deal with these reprint materials.

MS. CROSS: Bob?

MR. WALTER: I also would like to express my appreciation for the flexibility on this particular issue. I would like to ask -- and it came up in my state -- will there be any further outline of procedures in the Administrative Notes as to exactly how these would be handled, or are these the definitive notes?

Our regional library specifically was concerned. They wanted something in the Administrative Notes that gave some guideline than just this statement before they started doing what this statement says we could do.

MR. SCULLY: I will go with your recommendation on that. If you think that we should have some implementing guidance, either in Administrative Notes or published as a part of the Instructions to the Depository Libraries, we would be glad to do that. Would that make it more clear?

MR. WALTER: I think it probably ought to be in the Instructions. I hadn't even thought about that. But I think you could put a separate thing in forthcoming Administrative Notes, saying now, as of this date, you may handle this in such and such a manner.

MR. SCULLY: We will do that.

MS. CROSS: Kathleen?

MS. EISENBEIS: I am reminded that yesterday we found out you are not going to do Fact Sheets, and I think that ought to be brought up at this time. You could use the fact sheet mechanism to address reprints, as Bob was mentioning, because I think they are used as pieces of paper that people will use for that topic, and the fact that we are not going to have them anymore means that we need to replace them with something else.

MR. SCULLY: That brings up something that I haven't had a chance to mention yet. You will notice, those of you who are long-time comers to these programs know, that over the past three years or so we have had individual sheets, that we have called Fact Sheets, and each covers a various topic, maps distribution, claims, systems development, and all these kinds of various depository topics.

We have not backed off from providing the information, but we are putting it out in a little different format; that is, under a special issue of the Administrative Notes which has been distributed and which you have gotten. In fact, this one, the most recent issue, the special issue for this Depository Council meeting covers 14 points.

Now, a year ago those 14 points would have been dealt with individually on a Fact Sheet. So this is intended to combine all these and to make them more manageable and to provide for long-term retrieval and storage in your libraries, so you can go back six months or a year and see where it was.

Those Fact Sheets defied bibliographic control, if I could put it that way. Fact Sheets, I think, are much more manageable. I would appreciate hearing whether or not you favor this new approach we have. So you can just let me or any of the LPS people how you react to that.

MS. EISENBEIS: My real question or my real comment was I am pleased to see the mention of a graduate student. That is news to me and I think that that is a good way to approach working on problems and I wondered how that came about and if you intend to pursue it, and if some of us who are involved with library education couldn't help you, additionally.

MR. SCULLY: We certainly appreciate any offer for help. I can tell you about the graduate student arrangement. This was a kind offer of the staff of the Joint Committee on Printing to make this person available. Now, it is still tentative. We have not identified a person or fixed on it yet definitely, but that is our intent and it look like a good possibility that we will have that person available to study this matter next summer.

MS. CROSS: Bruce?

MR. MORTON: I would just like to put something on the record for the graduate student, when and if he or she appears. That is, that we ought to be careful that in studying the issue that is going to be studied, that we don't recreate the problem we just solved. The distinction I hear Bernadine making in terms of reprint of government publications as opposed to the reprint of a non-government publication by the government is irrelevant under the current depository guidelines if the library already has that information in-house.

The source of the information is irrelevant. The guidelines are quite clear in that one can dispose of government information if you are providing it in another format.

MS. CROSS: Council, any other questions or comments?

(No response.)

MS. CROSS: Audience? Lois?

A PARTICIPANT: Lois Mills, Western Illinois University. The question that was posed by Council mentions both preprints and reprints. The answer in no place speaks about preprints. Can we assume that the answer means preprints, as well as reprints? It does not say it at all. It just talks about reprints.

MR. SCULLY: That is true. That is true, but I think the way that we have responded to the question would cover that category of materials. In both cases, you have got an excerpt from a more comprehensive document.

MS. MILLS: I understand that, Mark, but you have to say it, or people are going to question it.

MR. SCULLY: All right. In our incorporation of this into the Instructions to Depository Libraries and our announcement in the Administrative Notes Newsletter will include that term.

MS. MILLS: Good. I have another question. I understand Council members have Administrative Notes 16, and are those going to be available for the audience, or do we have to wait until we get home and get them in a depository shipment? It is very nice to have the material at hand, so if any questions come up, you can ask them right now.

MR. SCULLY: Could I refer that to Marian MacGilvray?

MS. MacGILVRAY: That issue of Admin Notes was put together, I believe it was last Thursday it was finished, and I turned it over to Parker Covington in the Depository Distribution Division not until Friday morning. Normally, it takes them at least a week because it has to be collated, all 1,300-some copies -- actually, it is 1,600 copies that I order -- have to be hand-collated and it does take a good deal of time.

They turned 100 copies around for us in two days and we did have those here yesterday. I believe they are all gone now. This week the rest of the copies will be collated and put into the Depository Distribution and onto our mailing list, but we had very little time for that, and I think they did a fantastic job in getting the 100 copies that we did have available.

MR. SCULLY: I can say this. We could have a few copies over on the table and we will. So if you would want to pick it up -- it is only six pages and the format is easily read -- so if you would just pick it up, look it over, and then replace it to the table, everyone might get a chance to look at the copies available.

As Marian indicated, copies are being distributed to all depository libraries, so it will be back home when you get there.

MS. CROSS: Council, any further comments or questions?

(No response.)

MS. CROSS: Any further comments -- yes. Please state your name and institution.

MS. YUKAWA: I am Masako Yukawa, C.W. Post Center, Long Isla0d University.

I am glad that GPO decided to treat these reprints as excerpts, or whatever, by (inaudible) documents. (Inaudible) handles our problems. We can dispose or we can route to any other places, but I still recommend that you establish a new item for these items.

It may cost GPO some money to do so. However, these reprints, if we don't keep them in our library, is really printed at the cost of issuing agencies, and overall government money is wasted if we don't keep them.

MR. SCULLY: I can appreciate what you are saying and that was a consideration of the Superintendent of Documents when he made this decision. It is a matter of -- the decision was a cost/benefit kind of decision, and we considered that option -- but the resources simply were not available to create those extra item categories and to do the ground work over a reasonable period of time to take that course of action, so we had to step back and do something that was a little simpler procedurally, but which we think satisfies the needs of most regional and selective depositories, as well as being something that GPO could implement very quickly.

So it was not an easy decision, but we had to make it, and I think that what you are suggesting is something that will be factored into this graduate student study next summer as a possible option.

MS. CROSS: Any other comments?

MS. JACOB: In the future, where you have a new item for reprints, I mean you are not going to go on tacking them on to the same old -- I mean if you have a new series of reprints that becomes available, now that you know that it is -- do you see what I am saying?

MR. SCULLY: I see what you are saying, yes. Under this approach -- again, this is kind of an interim thing; from my standpoint I hope it is permanent, but who knows what this study next summer will come up with -- we intend to continue what we are doing. We do not intend to create new item numbers for reprints or to change anything in the way we do things.

What we are doing is extending to the depository libraries the latitude to make local decisions that make sense out there, but it would be quite burdensome and costly to GPO and we have got too many irons in the fire right now to undertake that major project.

So, again, we wanted some relief for the libraries. We think this gives it to them. But we intend to continue according to current policy and past policy on this.

MS. CROSS: Jim?

DR. VEATCH: Well, this comment that was made back here is kind of disturbing; that is, that there are likely to be libraries that are going to be getting stuff that they know as soon as it comes in, they are going to throw it away.

Now, isn't somebody out in the public going to get upset about this when they find out about it?

MR. SCULLY: The waste consideration was a factor, no doubt about it. In fact, we took that up. That was a serious concern of ours, that there might be wasted materials. I consulted with Barbara Appel and people who deal with this every day and asked them about the quantities, and the kinds of quantities and costs of the materials, these reprints, are such that that is not that significant a concern relative to other factors, such as the ones that the Depository Council has expressed to us; plus the fact that as we try this new procedure, this new policy over the next nine months or so, we will be watching that kind of thing, and that will be factored into this study next summer.

Now, is the waste unacceptable? Our attorneys say no, especially on an experimental basis, no, go with it and get a good feel for how much waste, discarded documents might be involved here -- superseded documents, I should say -- might be involved here.

So that is one thing we will be watching and assessing as we go. But we had to do something to give you folks relief right now, and this seemed to make the most sense at the time, and we will see if it doesn't work over the long haul.

MS. CROSS: Marian?

MS. CARROLL: I just wanted to say, Mark, I, at least, am grateful. I am pleased with it the way it is.

MS. CROSS: Bob?

MR. WALTER: I would like to encourage libraries that don't want to retain this material to consider strongly giving it to a nondepository library, especially one that might have a strong vertical file system. It would help perhaps educate people to some of the material you are getting, some of the things out of the FDA Consumer, some of the reprints out of FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin. Those things are very topical, very interesting, and if you have a nondepository library close to you, such as we have a public library in town that loves to have that type of information.

Rather than throw it in the trash can, put it out on the display table and encourage people to pick it up. There are all kinds of very useful things that will help promote your library, rather than as soon as you get it in a box, say, oh, this is a reprint and throw it in the nearest trash can.

I think there are a lot of uses that this stuff can be put to without using too much imagination.

MR. SCULLY: An excellent point. Thank you, Bob.

A PARTICIPANT: Olive Forbes, LBJ Public Affairs Library.

I would like to second that. I am grateful that I can dispose of some of it, but there are also very elegant ways of disposing of some of this material, and you have just suggested several.

Another one that is useful in an academic situation is often this provides a handy reprint for reserve reading collections, of which I happen to have a very large one. I happen to have trouble with a lot of government publications not lasting long enough. When I put the issue on the shelf for reserve reading, I don't have it there to bind later on.

So there are uses you can put to it and I plan to route this material and use if for current awareness and promotion of the depository.

MS. CROSS: Thank you.

A PARTICIPANT: Barbie Smith, University of Virginia. Again, as a regional, we are very pleased with this also. I would also like to suggest that in addition to doing the things that people have said, that people can recycle this material rather than throwing it away.

MS. CROSS: Good. Let's move on to the next recommendation, which you may not have. It is Number 8. Mark tells me there will be copies available this afternoon. I will read it. He will summarize it. Then, there will be a copy for you this afternoon. This is something that was responded to somewhat last minute and Mark can explain.

"Recommendation 8. The Council recommends that GPO be encouraged to provide as much selectivity to depository libraries as possible. The appending of new publication series to existing item numbers is costly and cumbersome for depository libraries, as well as increasing costs to GPO by distributing publications not desired by selective depositories."

MR. SCULLY: Now, before I begin reading the answer, let me say that this was the trickiest one to deal with. We had to consult with institutions outside GPO, various offices within GPO to kind of pave the way and come up with a reasonable approach that was legal and that made sense.

I will read the response and then I will say something about it just in general, because I know you do not have it printed in front of you.

LPS endeavors to balance library preferences against the countervailing factors of GPO system and resource limitations. In order to expand library selectivity and still preserve this balance, LPS proposes two approaches for alleviating the burden on libraries.

The first, a short-term project, will be to ask depository librarians to identify the 50 most problematical item numbers in need of being "split." Once identified, these item numbers will be researched by LPS and split-out where appropriate.

The second project will be long-term in nature and will require additional resources not presently available in LPS. The project will be to create a provisional item number under every issuing agency in the List of Classes. Thus, when a new-series title is received in LPS, copies will be ordered for all libraries that selected the provisional item number under that particular issuing agency.

This procedure will ensure that interested libraries do not miss the initial printing and "buys time" for LPS to survey the libraries with a permanent item number. In cases where the library declines a publication received under a provisional item number, the library may return the publication at the library's expense to an address specified by GPO.

The first short-term project will commence before the end of 1985. The second project can commence when two additional staff positions become available to LPS to perform the work involved.

So, again, what we did was to take a first-aid approach and then a long-term solution. The first-aid will be to solicit from the depository librarians, through Administrative Notes announcement, the 50 most problematical, which ones really hang you up and cause problems, in terms of batching categories of publications under one item number, that cause you to receive a lot of things you may not want, or otherwise tie you in knots out there in terms of your selection.

So tell us what they are and we will take a careful look at those and do something about the worst offenders, the worst offending item numbers, splitting them out, adjusting them in some way to make it easier for you. All right. That is the first-aid. That is something we can do fairly quickly.

The second, long-term, again will require resources. It is a big project. It means creating provisional item numbers, pigeon holes, if you will, under every agency listed in the List of Classes. Then, as a new publication becomes available, that does not fit any existing item number within that agency, we will fit it into the provisional as an interim thing.

So if you had prior selected that provisional for Small Business Administration, let's say, then you would get that publication even though it does not fit any SBA item number. You would, nevertheless, get it as a provisional. You would be able to look at it, you would have it in your collection, and subsequently, soon after we hope, you would get the survey and you would be able to select that permanently or not.

If you opted not to take that, then you would be able to return that publication to a GPO address. It would come back to the Federal Government and become again a part of the Federal system, and you would not have to retain it for five years, or whatever, out there.

So, again, that is long term. I think it will take probably a year to put into effect, but that is our intention. That is the best we can do right now and I think the combination of these two, short-term and long-term, will relieve some of the problem that you have got with these item numbers.

MS. CROSS: Yes, Marian?

MS. CARROLL: I have a question. You spoke about the library may return the publication at the library's expense. Back in ye olden days, when we used to get samples, I did not discard samples. I found samples very useful because they could either confirm the reason why you did not get something, or you could review it and look to see if maybe you should add that item later.

Will this be optional? This says "may." Does that mean may, that we may return them, or we may retain them, even though we may not select them?

MR. SCULLY: Absolutely. You are not compelled to return the book. If you elect to retain it in your collection, then of course you are obliged to keep it for five years as a selective indefinitely as a regional. So, no, you are not compelled at all. Please keep it, if you like.

MS. CARROLL: Thank you.

MR. SCULLY: But if you will recall, one year ago, at the Council meeting, this was a point of contention and it hung up this entire project; that is, this business of provisionals and whether or not the library would have to return it, or could return it to the government or retain it. That was a sticking point of this entire thing.

So over the past six months or longer, we have been looking for a solution and we think we have got one here. So we will try it.

MS. CARROLL: I do, too.

MS. CROSS: Kathleen?

MS. EISENBEIS: I, for one, think this is a good solution. It sounds good to me. I am questioning the last sentence again. "The second project can commence when two additional staff positions become available." Have those been requested? Is that in Acquisitions? What unit is that in? That is new information.

MR. SCULLY: That would be in the Depository Administration Branch, and these would be the people working for Barbara Appel and Earl Lewter and Barbara Johnson, setting up these new classes, actually inputting them into the computer and fitting them into the system. Barbara could give you much more depth and detail on that, but that is a pretty good estimate, I think, as to the level of effort and the number of positions that would be required to implement this longer term plan.

MS. EISENBEIS: That has been talked about before. I think Barbara has come to us before with this suggestion and I have never heard it said before that she needed two additional people. I am just wondering why that comes out now.

MR. SCULLY: I think in the past we did not get that far. We discussed it in concept and since the concept never flew, then we thought, oh, well, let's not even bother with considering resources if, you know, that is over the hill. But now we are to the point where presumably we agree that this is the way to go and then we can discuss implementation, and implementation means two people.

MS. EISENBEIS: In my experience, getting new positions added is a long process. At what point are you at in this?

MR. SCULLY: It is a long process. I can assure you that we will do our best to secure these positions, put through the proper requests and justifications and personnel forms and according to procedure.

MS. EISENBEIS: Are these new job descriptions?

MR. SCULLY: No, not really. These two people would be doing work similar to what we are doing now, only pretty much devoted to this new project, creating these categories.

MS. EISENBEIS: Fine.

MR. WALTER: I am somewhat concerned between the time period we are dealing with, between identifying 50 problems that we already have and hopefully if they happen in the future. What has been happening, and what I see still happening next week, a month from now, is LPS once again appending some mammoth new series to an item that is already there. I would just simply like to be on record, asking LPS to look at this carefully, and when you do have some new item come in, to think very hard about issuing a new item number.

I know this has happened in the Department of Defense and some other places, where the item number exists for something that was issued in very small amounts, and all of a sudden something is added that we might not necessarily want. That is what led to this request in the first place. And while dealing with the 50 will take care of those problems that are already there -- and we do have this, hopefully, long-range solution which I think is excellent and hope it does carry out -- we are going to have this interim period and we would like to see this problem kept to a minimum.

MR. SCULLY: This is a complex area and it is one that I would like to defer to Barbara Appel on.

Barbara, could you say something about the procedures that your staff follows in incorporating new series and new titles into the existing item number system, how they go about it?

MS. APPEL: Barbara Appel, Government Printing Office. Well, when we go ahead and add classes to item numbers, quite often the publications were already being sent out under that particular category, and their being given a separate classification number which is why it necessitates, in a lot of cases, a new item number.

So really, nothing gets changed. It is still going out under the same category to the same library. The others that we receive new in from various agencies, either they are new publications or we have recently been able to acquire the publications, we are adding in some cases two item numbers, because it has always been the policy of LPS to go ahead and add things that are alike together.

We have over 6,000 item numbers and we are trying to maintain some kind of decent control over the item number scheme. In a lot of cases, items do get added to things. That is the way I am operating now.

MR. SCULLY: Thank you, Barbara.

MS. CROSS: Bruce.

MR. MORTON: Am I to infer from what you said that one of the reasons that there is a need to control the item number scheme is that there is an inability on the part of your automated system DDIS, to accommodate much more growth? Am I to infer that one of the reasons that you need to control the growth of the item number system is that the ability of DDIS to accommodate growth is limited?

MS. APPEL: Yes, it is my understanding from our Data Systems people that currently we have over 6,000 item numbers which result in two and a quarter million selection records, and the more item numbers you have, the larger the selection file would be. We have trouble now printing that kind of information off whenever we have an update selection cycle. It is my understanding that there are some drawbacks there, although they are not the only ones.

MS. CROSS: Roz.

MS. JACOB: It sounds as if even if you get these two new people, that you still are not going to be able to add to the new item numbers. I mean you have got a provisional one, but when you take it out of the provisional one, it sounds like you are going to have to slip it on an existing number. I mean if you have not got the capacity to expand. It is not going to help make the system more responsive and make selectors able to really select what they want.

MR. SCULLY: The count, as I recall, of surveys, I believe is 325 per year. The provisional system would enable us to do an initial distribution on these 325 new publications coming into the system a year. But you are right, it would not change the number of new categories to be set up in the system. That would continue. It would not alleviate that problem. But at the same time, we do not project that it will run up, in the near future, it will run up the number of item selection categories up toward 10,000. It will be an incremental increase each year, just as it has been, so we don't think that the natural process of growth will continue.

This provisional system gives us the flexibility to do an initial distribution and not to miss the first publication which causes problems.

MS. JACOB: I think that is good, but it did not sound like it takes care of the whole problem.

MS. CROSS: Jim.

DR. VEATCH: Something else here seems real strange, that if a depository selects that provisional, and it gets thrown into an existing number, then the library may be getting a lot of other things it did not want that way. And not only that, but picking up things right in the middle of stuff. Isn't that right?

MR. SCULLY: I will have to defer to Barbara Appel. Barbara, what is the likelihood of something that would be put into a provisional item category, later winding up in a pre-established item category? I think that is the gist of your question, isn't it, Jim?

I mean if it is going to be fitted, to my understanding, if it is going to be fitted into an existing item category, then we would do that off the bat.

MS. APPEL: Yes, you are right.

MR. SCULLY: There would be no need to create a provisional, because it fits in a pre-existing category.

MS. JACOBS: But that defeats the purpose, doesn't it? Wasn't that to take care of adding -- wasn't the question, appending of new publication series to existing item numbers? So if this new plan is not going to -- if your new provisional isn't going to end up with these things --

MR. SCULLY: Well, okay.

MS. JACOBS: You are still going to go on tacking things on to old --

MR. SCULLY: Okay. I think we are talking apples and oranges here. What we are talking about -- a decision is made, Barbara just ran us through a brief tutorial on how a new publication is fitted into the system -- if, in their judgment, it logically and reasonably fits into an existing category, then it would so happen. It would go into that existing item category and it would be assigned that existing number.

If it does not logically and reasonably fit into an existing item category, our proposal is that it go into kind of a catch-all category we are calling a provisional category, until such time as a new item category can be assigned and a survey conducted among the libraries to see who wants to get it.

MS. JACOBS: Now, is that going to affect the adding on of new things to existing items? It isn't. That is going to affect the surveys that we already get.

MR. SCULLY: That is right. I don't think the two have a whole lot to do with each other. They happen to be in the same area of our operation, but one will not alleviate the other. The provisional, if -- let me put it this way -- the creation of a provisional item number scheme will not alleviate or affect substantially the placement or the assignment of new publications into existing item categories. They are separate matters.

DR. VEATCH: But we have got this right, that anything that is originally in the provisional will result in a new item number? That seemed to be what you were saying, right?

MR. SCULLY: I get a "yes" from Barbara Appel. Yes, in 99 percent of the cases. There are errors. One in 100, we are going to say, gee, we should have put that in that category originally. That is going to happen, but by and large, your understanding is correct. A new item number will be created for that provision.

MS. CROSS: Susan.

MS. TULIS: I think some of the confusion is that the provisional class actually answers Recommendation Number 9, which we have not addressed as of yet. It does not really answer the question of providing as much selectivity as possible -- because Number 9 talks about trying to somehow alleviate the problem for surveying, for new publication titles, which often results in distribution delays and missed publications. Setting up that provisional category would alleviate that problem.

Recommendation Number 8 is talking about adding to already existing item numbers, which really has not been answered. Maybe we need to rewrite our recommendation.

MS. CROSS: Very possible.

DR. VEATCH: This one definitely pertains to Number 8. In Albuquerque, we heard from a number of I think especially small libraries who said that because of adding things on, they had to cancel some classes, because they were just getting too much stuff.

I would hope that LPS, in selecting these 50, would take those kinds of situations especially into account.

MR. SCULLY: Barbara was in Albuquerque and we were. I am sure she heard that and she has heard it in her daily communications with librarians, I am sure. She bears that in mind, her people bear that in mind, and they exercise their best judgment in consideration of those concerns.

MS. CROSS: Roz.

MS. JACOB: A couple of years ago we had this chance to nominate terrible items, it seems to me, and maybe what you should do is do it every year, and not just once when we complain a whole lot, because maybe that would be a way to catch them.

MS. CROSS: Awful Item of the Year Award?

(Laughter.)

MS. CROSS: Anything from the Council?

(No response.)

MS. CROSS: We have a couple of people in the audience who have been waiting a long time.

A PARTICIPANT: Susan Dow, Suny Buffalo Law Library. I have a question, going back to 6 and 7, as it relates to this new 8, with these 50 item numbers.

How many preprints and reprints are there in the system, that are tacked onto item numbers already, and do you think that a lot of what you are going to get back as problem item numbers are going to be in those 50? Because if you are asking for 50 item numbers that you will work on, I am wondering what percentage of those 50 item numbers are going to come back being reprint and preprint series and whether or not, you know, how many items you have tacked preprints and reprints onto, throughout.

The other question I have -- which Barbara may have answered -- is the 50 because that is all the system can accommodate at this time? It that a workload problem or a system problem? Why was 50 chosen?

MR. SCULLY: We pulled 50 out of the air. We wanted to get started with something, a manageable number that would also be a meaningful number. We will work through those 50 and see how it goes, and if we decide at that point that it is worth expanding to 100 or whatever, then we will see where we are at. We had to control it in some way, contain it, and that is what we have done with the 50 . There is nothing magical about 50. It was just an attempt to get a manageable number.

As to the other question, as I understand it, the possibility, Barbara, of having people report reprint categories, that is, reprint item numbers, that contain the parent document and the reprinted excerpt in their 50, that is what you are asking, I do not know. How would you react to that? They could do it certainly if they find this to be a problem.

This will also be a good way to communicate with us because as we go down and see the patterns of problems that you send us on this, then that is going to tell us something about what your concerns are, too. I am sure patterns will shape up as we receive your top 50 problem item numbers. That will tell us something about where we are batching things and might give us some indication as to how we might do it better.

A PARTICIPANT: Susan Dow: Another point about statistics is that how are you assured of any -- you are just assured of titles that you have distributed, but if you have some libraries -- I mean I like the idea, because I like the idea that I can do something else with those publications -- but how do you take care of knowing which library has tossed that material as far as your statistics are concerned, or any kind of statistical measure, which is one of the things that Council has been trying to work on? You just won't have any idea of how many libraries are keeping those items, because they won't be items that everyone would normally supersede, the normal classes of things that are superseded.

You have got some libraries keeping them, some discarding them.

MR. SCULLY: That is a good point. I believe in the overall concept of the kinds of quantities, that is, the millions of documents we are distributing -- 28 million last year -- that we are distributing, that is a relatively insignificant portion of that and it probably wouldn't be a blip on the statistical scale, really, when you work out the data.

So it is just one of those things. You are right, it will undermine statistics to a degree, but we think that is -- again, on most of these issues, you don't win. It is not win-win, you know. You always lose something or sacrifice something for some kind of a gain in benefit, and that is what we are doing here. So that is one of the concerns.

MS. CROSS: Paul, you have been very patient.

A PARTICIPANT: Paul Thurston, Broward County Library, Fort Lauderdale. I am very much in favor of this catch-all category, but I have a few questions about it. I am a little worried about the mechanics and hoping that when this does come to pass, that you will be extremely careful about thinking out the mechanics of assigning item numbers and classification.

What I would hope would happen is, for example, if you selected the catch-all category from SBA, and they came out with, say, an information journal, which you did not have an item number assigned for, and sent it out under this catch-all for SBA, so we could all get it from Day One, that you would, before you listed it on a shipping list, go ahead and assign it its own class, so it could go ahead and be cataloged in the Monthly Catalog, and then if you do not assign it its final classification, then you are going to have to send out correction notes both for the Monthly Catalog and for the shipping lists.

So I think the mechanics of the classifying of this material is very important to you and to all of us, to make sure that is done prior to the time that it -- well, prior to the time that it is surveyed, it would have to already be on the shelf under the final number before we even agreed on whether or not we wanted to select it. Does that make sense?

MR. SCULLY: Yes, it does and I think it brings up this parallel scheme that we deal with and you deal with in your libraries, we deal with it here, and that is, handling the physical document through acquisitions and processing, and then handling and creating a bibliographic record for that, and having the two coordinate and run simultaneously.

You are right. There could be a breakdown there, and I am glad you mentioned it. We will try to be careful. There is a Monthly Catalog record created soon after the distribution of that and that a permanent item number and SuDocs number and catalog record are created within a reasonable time.

MS. CROSS: Fran.

A PARTICIPANT: Francis Buckley, Detroit Public Library. I was particularly pleased with the concept that you included in this proposal regarding the return of unneeded items by the library. I guess I would like to see you consider expanding that beyond the category of just these provisional materials, but also to encompass the return of items which may be sent to libraries by mistake, and that could be reused in filling claims for other libraries where you are short of items. And that is, recycling these publications for their best use in the total system.

MR. SCULLY: Thank you. I think particularly the category of materials that are received, that are not requested, because it is clear that something could be done about that in a similar way to this provisional.

Now, if you have requested it, I am afraid you keep it. The law is very explicit in that regard. But we will consider that for materials that you receive by mistake.

MS. CROSS: Any further comments on this? Bernadine.

MS. HODUSKI: I was just wondering if the 4,000 -- how that figure was arrived at, and also I am very curious as to whether these catch-all categories are going to satisfy the library community's need for the new class and item numbers. I mean are the new things coming along really going to fit into those standard categories, because it seems like the majority of things -- at least when I was at (Labor) -- they were added, had unique titles and we wanted unique item numbers assigned to them.

So I am wondering if you have thought about that or considered that. Also, the other thing that concerns me is of course the automation support for the entire program. I think that adding 4,000 -- and that is really, with this response, I think the first time I have seen that figure -- that is a considerable number to add to a system of things that may or may not ever be used, class numbers that may never be used, and yet those numbers where you actually have publications and you need to assign class numbers and item numbers, are going to continue to come into the system. You are going to continue to insist that they be separate categories.

So I am just wondering if that part of it has been considered. Also, the final thing that I bring up at every Council meeting, how long are we going to have to be burdened with two different sets of numbers, item numbers and SuDoc basic class numbers? It seems to me that that question needs to be discussed again. I think there needs to be some definite cost studies done on what it is costing us to add item numbers and have class numbers, and what this does to the whole automation support system.

MR. SCULLY: I think I can speak for LPS in saying that we would appreciate any advice or suggestions from Council or otherwise as to a replacement scheme or system, or simply a better way to do things. We are doing the best we can with the systems we have got, and we are not averse to improving them, and we are willing to look at anything, just as we look at, and give serious consideration to, all these Council recommendations.

So if you have got a proposal or suggestion of a better way to do it, I am all ears.

MS. CROSS: Diane.

MS. SMITH: I just want a little bit of information. What we have heard so far is that there are 6,000 item cards, 6,000 item numbers, and you are proposing expanding that by 4,000, to make it 10,000, correct?

MR. SCULLY: Yes.

MS. SMITH: Okay. So we know that the system has the capacity of dealing with at least 10,000.

MR. SCULLY: No, it doesn't.

MS. SMITH: No, it does not?

MR. SCULLY: What we are talking about here, we are talking about an approach. Our data systems analyst will faint when he sees what we are proposing here. All we are saying is in order to implement what you are proposing, this is what it will take. Now, implementing it is an entirely different thing.

They may say, well, gee, we will need a new main frame for that, or we need so many more people for that. Costs and implementing implications are another thing that we need to address that, but what we are talking about is an approach here.

MS. SMITH: Do you have an annual growth rate for the item numbers themselves over time, so you can sort of see what the pattern is?

MR. SCULLY: I will have to ask Barbara Appel. How many new item numbers do we add over the course of a year, Barbara?

MS. APPEL: Five hundred.

MR. SCULLY: Barbara tells me about 500. So that is the natural growth rate.

MS. CROSS: Jeannie.

A PARTICIPANT: Jeannie Isacco, OCLC. Eleven years ago the item number count was about 5,100; now, it is 6000. That is not 500 a year. I also want to know what the answer is to how did you come up with that 4,000. I think that is one of the things that Bernadine asked -- because I do not believe that figure, because if it was 5,100 eleven years ago, and it is 6,000 now, how can it then possibly grow by 4,000 overnight? I do not believe that.

MR. SCULLY: I will have to ask Barbara. Is that a current growth rate, Barbara? Was it pretty much stagnant for a period of time? All right. That is the answer I get from the people who work there, who deal with it every day.

A PARTICIPANT, Lois Mills: Also, they take out numbers periodically.

MR. SCULLY: That is true. There is a purging process, as Lois points up, so you have some dropping off the bottom and others being added to the top, which gives a stabilizing effect.

MS. CROSS: One more and then we are going to have to break.

A PARTICIPANT: Barbara Hulyk, Detroit Public Library. So far this morning, GPO has been presenting short-term solutions and long-term solutions, and I think the concept has been tremendous. I think that is what we need here. I think the talk of additional item numbers is probably a sort of a medium-term solution that is not going to be adequate for what we are looking for.

So maybe we ought to be talking in terms of the short-term suggestions we have heard this morning and then looking at ways of eliminating the item system totally and finding some other way, so that we can be more selective and also find out what kind of equipment would be necessary to maintain that kind of a system.

MR. SCULLY: I will just say thank you. That is a good observation. I am afraid I have been limited in my view this morning, but you are absolutely right. There is a first-aid short term, and then the medium term in terms of adding new item numbers, and then a longer, a revised system, a better system. But you are absolutely right. That is what we should be looking at and planning for.

MS. CROSS: We have had some good discussion. I regret, though, that we did not make it all the way through the recommendations. We will continue after lunch. Let's please try to be back at 1:00, because we do have a very full agenda this afternoon. There is a lot to discuss about the Monthly Catalog. There are some important things that I do not think you will want to miss. So we will see you at 1 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 12:05 p.m., a luncheon recess was taken.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

MS. CROSS: We are going to try to get through the recommendations as expeditiously as possible because we already had a full agenda for this afternoon with the open forum. So I may -- if discussion goes too long -- I may have to limit. So please try to make your remarks fairly brief, but I do not want to stifle any comment. I just do not want us to take too long on these. If necessary, we can discuss some further.

All right. We are at 9.

Recommendation 9. The Depository Library Council recognizes that the current LPS procedure for surveying selective depositories for new publication titles often results in distribution delays and missed publications, causing gaps in depository collections.

In October 1984, LPS proposed a plan for expanding the List of Classes structure. (It says attached. In the original recommendation, when we did it, the proposal was attached.) Council recommends that GPO develop an implementation plan for an expanded List of Classes structure. This plan should meet all legal and administrative requirements and be workable from a systems standpoint.

MR. SCULLY: The Library Programs Service fully endorses the concepts of an expanded List of Classes structure. However, successful implementation of the expanded structure presupposes two conditions. The first condition is an enhanced computer system capability that will manage a file of some 10,000 item numbers without severely degrading DDIS processing and terminal response time.

LPS is issuing a formal request to have the necessary enhanced computer system capability developed. The second condition is that all personnel vacancies in the Library Programs Service Depository Administration Branch be filled before undertaking the task of creating an additional 4,000 item numbers.

When these two requisite conditions are met, LPS will commence implementation of the expanded list of classes structure.

MS. CROSS: Do you wish to comment again, Susan?

MS. TULIS: Susan Tulis. Again, I just want to reiterate what I said earlier, that I do not think this question is answered here. We were asking for an implementation plan, of which there is none, and it does state that as soon as the two conditions are met, they will commence implementation of the expanded List of Classes.

Some of the questions that had come up about this List of Classes, using the expanded list of classes, was how they were going to implement it. At that time was when we touched upon the issue of having a provisional class. Again, I still think the answer to Number 8 addresses this more than anything else.

I guess my question now is, if you go into this provisional item number, are you also going to implement the expanded list of classes?

MR. SCULLY: Provided that the two conditions are satisfied, yes, that is our plan. But we think that the creation of the provisional item numbers is something achievable and that would require something less than the level of resources necessary to do this expanded list of classes arrangement.

We are talking substantial resources here, both computer processing capacity and storage capacity, as well as filling personnel positions and being fully staffed. I do not see this as something happening on the short term, frankly, but what we wanted to do was to respond and say yes, indeed, this is a reasonable approach.

Now, if the resources are forthcoming, then we can launch it.

MS. CROSS: Council, any other comments?

(No response.)

MS. CROSS: Audience?

A PARTICIPANT: Barbara Hulyk. Would you expand on what you mean by an expanded List of Classes. Are you talking with or without item numbers?

MR. SCULLY: I am sorry that we do not have that attachment sheet that is referred to here readily at hand. In concept, the objective here is to create a standard set of comprehensive classes or categories under each Federal agency and department in the List of Classes, whether or not any publication has previously been issued by that agency under that. So you have handbooks and manuals and technical reports and annual reports, and whatever other categories there are.

Now, whether a given agency has issued something is immaterial. We would create that. Now, if at such time that agency should come up with a publication that would fit one of those classes, then we would not have to survey, we would not have to go through all that business.

A PARTICIPANT: Barbara Hulyk: So what we are dealing with then are two issues: the expanded list of classes being simply a classifying tool and a useful tool for everybody to know where something belongs, and the whole issue of the selection of any of those classes is still to be resolved, of whether you go item numbers or, far down in the future, you go to the list of classes itself?

MR. SCULLY: Well, this would really facilitate the work of the Depository Administration Branch, Barbara Appel's people, in that they would have a much better chance of finding a suitable category for any new publication that might come across. That is its purpose.

So you are going to have far fewer surveys, less delay, and the basic payoff is we will be able to make a decision right at the front end, immediately, in most cases, which we cannot do now, because you say, gee, there is no class for me to put this publication in. So I have got to survey it and that takes time, and store it, and delay the distribution of it to the depository libraries.

We want to get away from that and create an entire comprehensive structure of item classes, so that we are able to make that decision and place that new publication into the existing item class scheme at the outset. This would enable us to do that much better.

A PARTICIPANT: Barbara Hulyk: Maybe I am not seeing too clearly, but we are talking about two separate things: one, the ease of classification and assignment of a new publication; and, two, a class list that accommodates them, and we are not dealing in any terms the selection process for selective libraries.

I mean you are not combining that with the abandonment of the item number system.

MR. SCULLY: No, there is no suggestion of that here. Far from abandoning the item number system, this would expand it considerably and go in the other direction.

MS. CROSS: Jim.

DR. VEATCH: Jennie, do you or does any other member of Council have this structure for the List of Classes?

MS. CROSS: Yes.

DR. VEATCH: There seems to be a lot of confusion out there, as well as on my part, about just what we had intended there in expanding the List of Classes.

MS. CROSS: Perhaps we should get that -- I do have it in one of my files here -- get that duplicated and then come back and talk to that when we do have it rather than trying to describe it, because it is, as I recall, two pages or three pages. It was a proposal that was done by LPS and we have discussed it in the past. So, in doing this recommendation, we added that to it for the rationale, you know, stating that we were supporting that expansion. Why don't we do that and come back and I will get the material out, except you wanted to say something.

MR. WILKINS: All I wanted to know, Mark, you mentioned that there were substantial additional resources needed. Have you got a cost estimate on that?

MR. SCULLY: No, we need to take that up with our computer analyst group and get the cost of that. No, to answer that, we do not have a cost estimate. It will be substantial, but I cannot put a dollar figure on that right now.

MR. WILKINS: Seven figures or six figures?

MR. SCULLY: I really could not respond to that right now. If it is the sense of Council that we pursue this now, as we are proposing it, then we move into actually doing that.

MS. CROSS: We will come back to this recommendation.

Recommendation 10. The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that a Fact Sheet be issued which summarizes GPO's response to the improvements listed in the GAO Report, entitled "Government Printing Office's Depository Library Program, GAO/AFMD-85-19."

MR. SCULLY: Rather than read these verbatim, let me characterize the response and see if that is sufficient, explain it in plain language.

Let's see. The first has to do really with the paper that Don Fossedal and Bernadine Hoduski were talking about this morning, and in fact, that Bernadine had done in a preliminary way. In fact, copies right now are over on the table. What this is essentially is guidance to the Federal agencies to inform them of the types of their publications that are suitable for the Depository Program and those that are not suitable for the Depository Program.

So the guidelines in a preliminary draft form are over on the table. It's that tall stack. That pretty much responds, I think, to the first one. There it is.

The second one, to improve the classification process, institute quality control procedures. All right. In terms of the classification process, we have just distributed copies -- I will borrow Jennie's here -- of "A Practical Guide to the Superintendent of Documents Classification System," which was prepared under contract by Mae Collins, who is seated in our audience now.

This is the final version, but this is only a photocopy of it. A formal typeset copy is being prepared now and will be distributed to depository libraries before the end of this calendar year. So that has to do with the classification.

Quality control procedures. I am having extra copies made of that latest Administrative Notes, and there is at least a page -- a lot more than a page having to do with quality control procedures and statistics on that very subject. So we have responded to that here. I think that is the essence of the second one.

And they mention recommendations concerning cataloging for government documents to improve procedures for cataloging performed under contract. As of October 1st, 1985, we were no longer having cataloging work done on contract. The contract does not exist in Fiscal Year 1985, so that does not apply.

Discontinuing personal name authority work. The direction we received from the Depository Council was not to discontinue name authority work. And to implement cooperative cataloging project with other Federal agencies. That we have not done. We have some concerns about the resource costs of establishing such a project, but we have not done that.

MS. CROSS: Any comments, questions? Kathleen.

MS. EISENBEIS: Does the end of the contract mean that the backlog has gone? I mean this is the first I think we have heard that you have discontinued the contract. Is there still a backlog?

MR. SCULLY: There is a backlog. In fact, we have just -- two weeks ago I put together a projection for the retirement of that backlog. At the current level of staffing, it is about a year and a half projected to retire the backlog. If we are able to hire on additional catalogers beyond the projected 21 catalogers that we will have as of January 1st coming, if we are able to hire one or two or three, to that extent it will reduce the period of retiring that backlog. So if we start with 21 catalogers, 21 catalogers will mean an 18-month period, 18 to 19 months, and then if it is 22 catalogers, it will reduce it down to 15 months, and so forth, down. But 19 months is the worst case is what I am saying.

MS. EISENBEIS: What was the rationale for dropping the contract?

MR. SCULLY: We found that essentially we were involving our people's time to a considerable degree in administration of the contract, that is, more than three people were involved in administering the contract, giving out work, taking in work, quality review, that kind of thing, plus another equivalent of -- Sally, how many catalogers were involved in revision?

MS. McLEAN: At least three minimum.

MR. SCULLY: At lease three minimum. So that is six people. Now, this, I do not wish to criticize or denigrate the work or the cooperativeness of our cataloging contractor. It was a fine firm and they did a great job. But it was what we found in terms of administering the contract that brought into question the use that it served.

So we are going to try it for a year without the contract, and we will monitor it carefully over the next six months, see how it goes. So far, Sally and Jorge tell me that we are going very nicely without the contract. So we will see how it goes. If we have to reinstate the contract, if that should happen in Fiscal '87, well, we can always fall back on that and make good use of the experience we have had behind us, in having had a contract for the past three or four years. So that is always an alternative that we have available to us.

But for now it was the administrative costs and it was, in terms of our people's time, as well as the amount of revision that had to be done by our senior catalogers of the contract work, that inclined us to go it alone for at least a year, and we will be monitoring it and letting you know how it goes since we have brought it in-house.

MS. EISENBEIS: In terms of adding staff, then, what is your priority? Don't you have to prioritize? You are talking about staff for the other thing and staff for this thing. Where is your sense of the priority?

MR. SCULLY: We have allocated 21 of our positions to Cataloging. That is where we stand now.

MS. EISENBEIS: I don't know how that compares.

MR. SCULLY: Well, Sally, you could help me out on this. How does 21 compare -- well, right now it is 18 -- we have got three more in the pipeline now and those are people coming on, but it is safe to say, by January 1, we will have 21 catalogers on board, and with that level we can retire the backlog in 18 months?

MS. McLEAN: And with that you have allowed us the lion's share of LPS' hiring.

MR. SCULLY: That is right.

MS. MacGILVRAY: If I could add a few words to that. I was very curious myself, as head of one of the cataloging sections, how we would get along without the contract which ended on September 30 of this year. So I looked at our statistics for cataloging productivity for the first two weeks of October and found that because we no longer had to invest our time in reviewing contractor material, our catalogers could use that time for our own cataloging, and we actually saw a slight increase in overall cataloging productivity.

During the last year, our total cataloging productivity average per day was 109. That is combined contractor and GPO. For the last two weeks, which is a small sample, our in-house cataloging productivity was an average of 113 per day. So just on that basis, we can maintain the present productivity, and if we increase our staff, of course, that would bring the backlog to zero as long as receipts do not increase.

MS. CROSS: Jim.

DR. VEATCH: How many catalogers were there before the contracting started?

MR. SCULLY: That really predates my coming to the Library Programs Service. Maybe Sally or someone could -- before this meeting I looked at trends over the past four years in the Library Programs Service in terms of staffing, and I found that we have added more and more to the Depository Administration Branch, because their responsibilities have expanded.

The International Exchange Program, for one, has inflated their workload considerably. We are doing Congressional work. We are doing microfiche work for Congressional Committees, and that is becoming a bigger and bigger workload. Consequently, for reasons like that, the workload and the level of staffing, as a percentage of the entire LPS staffing level, has increased substantially.

On the other hand, the Cataloging and Classification Branch has shrunk during that same period. But if you look at the gross figure, our overall level of staffing has remained more or less constant. But that is a deceptive figure because, as I say, the work and the scope of responsibility of Depository Administration has gone up and Cataloging has gone down.

DR. VEATCH: Is the money saved from the contract primarily going for the new salaries for the new positions, or is that money going to be used someplace else in LPS, that is going to help us out in some other way that we have not heard about?

MR. SCULLY: Perhaps Mr. Fossedal would give us his thoughts on that.

MR. FOSSEDAL: I cannot answer your question specifically because it is not a direct relationship. I work with a $25,600,000 budget. I cannot say that because I am going to save $140,000 on a contract, that necessarily would go to $140,000 in employees. Parker Covington might need a mount on the lighted bin system. I would say we will probably add a couple more catalogers, but I never make commitments at Council.

MS. CROSS: Barratt?

MR. WILKINS: Did I miss something? I may have. You indicated you had 18 catalogers and you were doing 113 documents a day?

MR. SCULLY: We stand at 18 catalogers now. Marian said 113 documents.

MR. WILKINS: And that means six per person per day. Is that what you are doing? Or do you do other things other than that?

MR. SCULLY: They do some other things. Maybe Sally can elaborate. Name authority work and other things like that.

MS. McLEAN: They perform name authority work. One cataloger exclusively does name authority work. One cataloger does series authority work. I have two catalogers pulled off now doing the serials Periodical Supplement, which they have been doing for a month, to have all the cataloging updated and all those records reviewed. They have to call up each record to see if the publications are still viable, and then they have to catalog. I think we have cataloged 80 new ones, new records for this Supplement alone. So I have two that are not producing any measurable work that even touches the backlog right now.

Then, they have other projects as assigned.

MR. SCULLY: If I could say something, Barratt, this goes back about three, four years. At the request of the then Superintendent of Documents, I personally did a survey of four or five Federal agencies in terms of cataloger's productivity.

The National Library of Medicine was one. The

Department of Transportation was another, and two others I cannot recall. Essentially, it came out to like .9 to 1.1 books per hour. Basically, a book an hour. That was from five, I think, Federal agencies averaged.

MS. CROSS: Jeannie.

MS. ISACCO: Jeannie Isacco, OCLC. I have two questions. One is the revision work that needs to be done on cataloging has been used for a rationale for a long time, both in terms of the contract work and in terms of cooperative cataloging. Since you had the contract for three or four years, or five, or however many it was, I assume you kept a fairly accurate and a good count of the percentage of errors done by contract catalogers.

Could you tell us what you found? In fact, were your fears borne out? In fact, was there a high percentage of errors that would substantiate the need to have the amount of revision done that you did?

The second question I have is I find it alarming that the number of cataloging records are going down while the number of publications printed, both in print and in microfiche, is going up. I wonder if you are not adding any items to the depository workload, why aren't you and are there projections for adding things in that we have in the past wanted?

MR. SCULLY: Well, to answer the second question first, I think over the past two to three years, we have seen major new categories come into the program. Some, there are representatives here, this afternoon, from U.S. Geological Survey and Defense Mapping Agency, and the Department of Energy. Those are two that come to mind. Most recently, the U.S. Tax Court are bringing all their memoranda opinions in, and that is happening right now.

EEOC is another. So, yes, we are picking up more from the agencies, and consistent with what Mr. Fossedal and Bernadine have been talking about, when OMB promulgates these guidelines or enforces them, to use Don's word, we expect to see even more when the Executive agencies feel the bite of enforcement and realize they are going to have to start submitting all of their publications. So I think the trend is clearly up on that score.

Now, as to your first question, Sally, could you or one of your people tell about the contract experience? I do not have figures. I have not been that close with it. I see Mitch Phalen in the audience. Mitch, Gil is not here, is he?

Gil Baldwin would be your best witness on that one. He was, in fact, the project manager or the contract officer's technical representative. COTR is the formal term. But he was our man running that contract. Gil monitored it day to day. I do not know if Gil is coming over, but we might ask him to speak to that question.

I could get figures, but Gil, I am sure, could pull them off the top of his head. He has been very close to that for a long time.

Sally, do you have anything to add to that in terms of, in general or specific terms, about what we encountered, the cost to LPS staff time for doing the revision on the contractor's work?

MS. McLEAN: No, not at the time anyway.

A PARTICIPANT: Jeanne Isacco: My question is not about costs at all. My question is about percentage of records that had to be actually revised. I mean it has been a fear -- it is a logical fear -- but I wanted to know whether or not, because you have had the contract and because you had that experience, and those statistics would be logical to keep, if you kept statistics on what percentage of cataloging actually had to be revised, actually had to be reviewed. A sampling technique is what is more commonly used rather than revising every single record. I just wanted to know the percentage.

MR. SCULLY: Yes. Let me talk with Gil Baldwin between now and tomorrow afternoon and we will address that tomorrow afternoon when we have got our best witness here, or at least have gotten some information from him.

MS. CROSS: I think since we do not have the exact figures at hand, we are sort of spinning our wheels, so let's move on and then we can pick this one back up when you have had a chance to get some data together.

Recommendation 11. The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that GPO investigate the use of a "delete" record plus local field as opposed to the 500-field for the linking note between corrected entries in the Monthly Catalog. A delete record is the mechanism used on LC MARC tapes to indicate that present record deletes an earlier one.

There was a rationale. The linking note in the printed Monthly Catalog might be better included in a local field, so that libraries loading tapes could search for and delete the note if they so desire. This would enable GPO to provide a high-quality product, consistent with its statutory makeup.

MR. SCULLY: The Public Printer shares Council's concern for quality Monthly Catalog publications and subscriber tapes. Therefore, the Government Printing Office has submitted a proposal to the Network Development and MARC Standards Office of the Library of Congress to develop a field that would display the obsolete Monthly Catalog identification number.

GPO will keep Council apprised of progress on this task.

MS. TULIS: I know the response to this was written earlier in the summer. Has there been any progress yet?

MS. McLEAN: Sally McLean, GPO. We have been reviewing the new specs for the Monthly Catalog and that has been our primary emphasis plus keeping the regular Monthly Catalog production running.

I have hired, I hope, an administrative librarian who will take Monthly Catalog and give it her full attention. She will go into this further.

MS. CROSS: All right. Seeing no other hands, we will move on to 12.

The Depository Library Council recommends that LPS review the paper, "The Senate Numbering Scheme" reviewed by John A. McGeachy of North Carolina State University. (That was also attached.) The Depository Library Council recommends that LPS then also poll the depository library community on its preference in using this numbering scheme in the SuDoc classification. This poll should query each depository as to which Senate items are selected, the desirability of separate item numbers for Senate hearings and prints and its classification preference between the present scheme (S. PRT., S. HRG., et cetera) and the past policy of classification, for example, Y4.S76/2:W84.

MR. SCULLY: The Senate numbering scheme reviewed by J.A. McGeachy has been reviewed by LPS Staff and the response will be published in Administrative Notes, Vol. VI, No. 10.

In Administrative Notes, Vol. VI, No. 5, LPS polled the library community on its preference for continuing the use of Senate numbering in the SuDocs Class, or returning to past practice or using some other method of classifying Senate publications.

Of 567 responses received, 22 were in favor of using some other method, 211 were in favor of returning to past practice and 330 were favor of continuing the use of Senate numbering in the SuDocs Classes. On four responses, no preference was indicated.

In light of these results no changes are contemplated in the classification of Senate publications. LPS plans no changes in its assignment of item numbers for Senate publications. Therefore, the survey did not query depositories on item numbers.

MS. CROSS: Council?

MS. SMITH: I have two comments. One is from Sandy, in which she says that the depositories have spoken, at least half of them and the other half, perhaps they don't care.

The other comment tends to deal -- I think this is a much larger issue. The comments that you did get told you that there is a disgruntlement, I feel, with this changing of classification in mid-stream without asking us and without considering the impact on our staff and on our stacks. I think that is where the real concern is.

I think we probably should discuss this later on in the meeting with the discussion of classification. I know the classification manual might answer some of those issues, but there seems to be a lack of understanding of that the impact is. It may be, to you, a small change, but to us it is a tremendous one.

MR. SCULLY: I might say that Marian MacGilvray conducted the actual survey and reviewed the returns. She might be able to give some sense of what the community felt and expressed.

MS. MacGILVRAY: I can appreciate your concern for our making changes with no notice. I was a fairly new section chief at the time, in January of '81, when I was invited to go to the Senate for a meeting of Senate staffers, Joint Committee on Printing staffers and GPO people.

We were told that the Senate numbering system was in place, it had already started and that we were to use the number in our classification system. Since we are always delighted to have a number to put into the classification rather than cuttering, and we were told that this is what we should do and we did it.

I can certainly see that it has caused quite a lot of consternation in the depositories.

MS. CROSS: Does anyone wish to comment further?

MS. CARROLL: Hold it for later.

MS. CROSS: Okay, we will hold it for later.

Number Thirteen. The Depository Library Council recommends that the Public Printer review SOD-13. In particular Council asks that both the dual distribution of reference works in paper and fiche, for example gazetters, Official Gazette and the prohibition of fiche conversion for publications fewer than 15 pages in length, be studied.

MR. SCULLY: LPS agrees to offer Official Gazette to depositories in both paper and fiche formats. LPS will use this title as a case study to assess the workload impact on LPS before considering an expanded dual distribution policy for other titles.

The 15 page minimum standard was established as a result of a cost benefit study some years ago. While this standard has proven practical, GPO would not hesitate to modify this standard if good reason is indicated.

MS. CROSS: Kathleen?

MS. EISENBEIS: Mark, what kind of a time frame do you have for the case study?

MR. SCULLY: For the case study?

MS. EISENBEIS: Yes. You have not given any time.

MR. SCULLY: I would estimate a year to see what the increased work load is.

MR. WALTER: Mark, one problem that was brought to my attention last spring when this case up on the matter of the SOD-13 Policy on microfiche conversion, is that there were a few series where if you had one thing -- the series is designated to be in microfiche. So, you had four items that were twenty pages long and they were all in microfiche. You had one item that was eight pages long and it came out in paper, which really created a problem in libraries as far as where to locate the thing. The series was bouncing back and forth between microfiche and paper.

I understand the rationale behind the policy, cost-wise, but I think this is putting a real burden on libraries. At least if there could be some policy where the series is already designated to be in microfiche, and if occasionally there is something that falls below that fifteen page minimum standard then it could also be done in microfiche. If it turns out that the majority of the materials fall below that 15 page threshold, then perhaps the series should be changed to all paper.

MR. SCULLY: It makes sense to me. Carla, how do we handle a situation like that; could you tell us?

You have a monthly journal subscription and most issues come out 30 pages and you fiche them. Then one issue is 13 pages, what do you do? Is there a procedure for that?

MS. SPENCE: In that case, we still go ahead and do it in the designated format.

MR. SCULLY: So, there is consistency. If you set something up in one format or the other you stay with it. That was my understanding. I hope we are doing that. If we are not, tell us about it.

MS. CROSS: Are there further comments from the Council?

(No response)

MS. CROSS: Audience?

All right. Recommendation Fourteen.

The Depository Library Council reiterates its recommendation that catalog monographic series, for example, USGS Professional Papers and serial records in addition to the individual analytic for each monographic series. These records should appear in the Monthly Catalog tape products as soon as possible.

Until these records are printed in the Monthly Catalog a printed list of the serial records for the purpose of identifying them on the GPO tape should be made available.

A PARTICIPANT: Jorge Ponce, GPO Library.

To follow the lead of some of the earlier speakers, I think I am going to tell you the bad news first and then I will tell you the good news.

The bad news is that GPO cannot handle the cataloging of monographic series because if we did, the serials backlog would be increased tremendously. At the same time, the time limits of the cataloging records appearing in the Monthly Catalog would be adversely affected.

However, we do recognize the importance of having cataloging records for libraries that have their holdings in on-line catalogs. Therefore, we are proposing to the library community the establishment of a cooperative cataloging project where libraries who would want to contribute to this project, like classify and catalog the monographic series.

They will have a national authority, like the Library of Congress, approve the cataloging and then the people, the editorial staff here at LPS would be willing to compile the final document where all the data will be found.

MS. CROSS: Susan?

MS. TULIS: I am asking this for for some other people, so if I don't make sense, I am sorry. I was asked if you can document that the serials backlog would be increased beyond manageable levels, and also how many currently distributed serials are there right now.

MR. PONCE: What was the second part?

MS. TULIS: How many serials are currrently being distributed? Do you know what the number is of the serial titles?

MR. PONCE: I do not have the numbers with me, I am sorry.

MS. TULIS: Could you get it some time?

MR. PONCE: How many serials have been distributed is not my area. It would be the Depository Administration Branch.

MS. TULIS: Well, what about the other question, can you document that the serials backlog would increase beyond manageable levels?

MR. PONCE: Well, I can tell you that cataloging monographic series is a very difficult venture. It is not like cataloging a simple serial when you are dealing with one issue. When you are cataloging a monographic series, you are dealing with a lot of issues for that particular monographic series. To be honest with you, even if we had the staff and the time, there is no way that we could catalog them, because we lack a national collection. We do not have the resources and staff time or collection to embark on a venture of this nature.

MS. CROSS: Do you have further comments, Susan?

MS. TULIS: No.

MS. CROSS: Council?

(No response.)

MS. CROSS: Audience?

(No response.)

MS. CROSS: Mark, do you wish to say anything? I think we have gotten to the good news.

Recommendation 15. The Depository Library Council applauds the Superintendent of Documents' efforts in promoting the sales program through the depository system and promoting the depository system through the sales program.

MR. SCULLY: Even I can handle this one. The Superintendent of Documents thanks the Depository Library Council for its enthusiastic support of our plans to develop cooperative projects between the depository and sales programs. We are currently designing a pilot study on local promotion of government publications by depository librarians and considering the acquisition of portable display units for use by librarians at local conferences.

We will keep Council informed of the progress of these studies as they develop.

MS. CROSS: Any comments?

(No response.)

MS. CROSS: We do have at least three recommendations that we will have to go back and do some little cleanup and get further information, and we will come back with that either tomorrow or Friday.

I would like to turn the podium now over the Diane Smith who will chair our Open Forum session. We do have a number of things to cover and I hope that we can get through as many as possible. Thank you, Diane, in advance for doing this.

COMMITTEE-OF-THE-WHOLE/OPEN FORUM

(COUNCIL/GPO ISSUES)

MS. DIANE SMITH, CHAIR-ELECT

MS. SMITH: We have a very full agenda, as Jennie has already mentioned. I would like to go over the very broad topics. I have gone through and picked out all the various things. We have received letters from people, or comments that were made, at the last meeting that we promised we would go over. So we have very broad categories and the order in which they will probably be discussed.

First of all, there are bibliographic issues, access issues, bibliographic control issues, the Maps Depository Program. If those two things do not fill up our time, until five o'clock, we can then go on and discuss acquisitions issues, which would get into the rainchecks and the item numbers, and we have administrative issues, and then anything else that you all can think of, that does not fall into one of those general categories.

I have some general or specific things under each of these categories that Council will be discussing and we would like comments from the audience under each of those catagories. If we finish bibliographic control, and you have something that we have not talked about, let me know and we will add it and we will talk about that, as well, today.

First of all, I would like to introduce somebody. I have asked a member of my staff to give a presentation today. The title of this is "Additional Comments on the GPO Tapes". This person who is going to give the talk, her name is Carolyn Jamison. Some of you may know her already.

Carolyn is, I feel at least, a rare breed in that she can speak cataloging -- something I know that I do not know a lot about -- she speaks documents, and she understands about systems. She has been doing some investigation about the GPO tapes. In talking to me about things, I realized how much I did not understand, and I think a lot of us need some education about the tapes.

So if I may introduce Carolyn Jamison from Penn State University. Carolyn.

STATEMENT OF CAROLYN C. JAMISON

PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

MS. JAMISON: I have to make a disclaimer. I am not an expert in any of those areas.

A couple of months ago I started this investigation and one of the of the first things I did was I called Mark Scully, and I asked him if he cringed when anyone said "GPO tapes" to him, and he very graciously laughed. I have come to believe that that is one of the things that we need to always keep in mind and to be when we deal with the GPO tapes, or we talk about them, we have to be gracious and we have to keep our sense of humor about the whole situation.

At Penn State -- let me explain a little bit about what I do -- I am a part-time Documents Librarian. Two-thirds of my time is spent in the Documents Section. One-third of my time is spent as a general social sciences cataloger. I am not specifically a documents cataloger. I handle all kinds of social sciences material.

As part of my responsibilities as a documents cataloger, I was asked to plan for the inclusion of documents into our On-Line Catalog. We have had an On-Line Catalog in operation since about 1971 -- excuse me 1981. Oh, well, I have only been there about a year and a half, what do I know.

As part of this planning process, I was asked to do an analysis of the GPO tapes to see whether or not we could use those with our system. From the very thorough studies that Judy Myers has done over the years, I found out that there were problems with the tapes. A lot of it has to do with cataloging. Judy has always mentioned the problem of documentation for these tapes.

So I knew that I had my work cut out for me. So what I started doing was looking around. Most people gave me the advice of do not try to load the tapes, they are a nightmare. But I had to do this analysis, so I started looking into things.

One of the first things I did is I went down and talked to our systems people to find out what kinds of things I needed to know about it. That is essentially the reason I am here today. I feel that we need the technical documentation. One of the first things the system person told me was that we needed to know about density, about blocking factors, about field formats, validation programs. And I am going, "Wait a minute, I do not understand all this."

So I began to feel my way through this and find out what we needed to know. I have come to the conclusion that all of this is part of the technical documentation that is needed and one of the reasons I am here at Council today is to urge Council to consider recommending to GPO that this technical documentation be fully developed. I understand that the Work Statement that has been prepared for the tape cleanup project contains information on requests for LC to provide the documentation, but I would hope that I can add an emphasis to this. Please, let's provide a little bit more information.

What I have to say about the tapes is based on a lot of telephone calls and as pieced together from these calls, and from reading about what little bit there is in the literature about tape processing in general.

When you find out about the blocking factors and the density, and all, what you are dealing with is basically the physical format of the tapes. The Library of Congress plainly tells you that the GPO tapes are available in nine-track tapes, 1600 or 6250 CPI in an expanded version of ASCII. I presume, to a systems operators, that means something. You can tell immediately, when you know that, whether or not the tapes can work on your system or not.

The problem really arises when you try to load these tapes onto your system, and when you are doing that, what you are doing is processing them through a validation program. The validation program has to deal with the field format of the tape. It is like an interface between the tape that you are trying to load and the computer system. It looks at the content structure of the tape. It is looking at field tags, subfields, indicators that mark locations of data on the tapes.

Validation programs can vary in sophistications and the simpler ones, and I suspect the more common ones, if a validation program encounters a field that it does not recognize, the program blows up and you cannot load the tape. I suspect that many times this is what happens when people have tried to load the GPO tapes, they are working with a validation program that is not as sophisticated as some can be. It is kind of hard to know exactly what has happened when people have tried to load the tapes, because it is not documented in the literature very well.

Many validation programs may be like the one on which our system operates. We do not support the complete MARC format. There are certain fields that our system does not handle. As a result, our validation program does not work. If it comes across one of these MARC fields, it cannot load the tapes.

That is why we need the documentation for the field format. If you look at a GPO record or any record in OCLC, for that matter, you have seen all the codes at the top of the screen and the numbers beside the field -- you have seen the field tags, you have seen the subfield codes within the data itself.

In addition to what you see on that screen, there is additional information on the computer tape. There is a leader and a directory which is essentially a string of characters that mark the place, the ending of the information on the record itself. All of this is very necessary for the computer to be able to process the tapes. Again, you can begin to see the need for the documentation of what this tape looks like, what the tape contains.

Most of the fields in a record are directly connected to the cataloging information. For example, the 245 is generally the title, the 086 is the documents classification number, and so on. Most libraries keep very careful records on how and when they have used the various fields in their cataloging. It is a record of their cataloging practices.

This record becomes invaluable when a library wishes to use its archive tapes to produce a product, whether it is a COM catalog, an On-Line catalog, or some other kind of product. This record becomes part of the documentation that facilitates the loading of the tapes. It documents the field format. It lets the validation program know what to expect.

Over the years there have been many new fields added to the MARC formats to accommodate documents information. To understand the GPO tapes, it is necessary to know when GPO began using the various fields and to know any exceptional uses of the fields, such as its practice of using two subfields in the 536 field, which is the funding information note, that are not defined in the MARC format.

This type of information again is part of the technical documentation that is needed by libraries out there. When we subscribe to the tapes and we want to make an application, we need to know what these fields are like, what is contained in them, what to expect from it.

The other part of the technical documentation that I feel is needed is a description of exactly what happens to these tapes from the time they are received by GPO until the time they are resold by the Library of Congress. This may seem to be a strange request, but what many of us have not realized over the years is that the GPO OCLC archive tape goes through about three or four different processes in its preparation from the time it is received here until it is sold at GPO.

First, it is run through the SAMANTHA Program here at GPO to convert from OCLC MARC format to a tape that can be used to the computerized publication system at GPO to produce the Monthly Catalog. At this point, the records and indexes are dumped to a printout and manually edited. The corrections are made to the tape and a Monthly Catalog is produced. This tape, with these corrections, is then sent to LC to be sold.

One of the good things about attending workshops like this is that you find out exactly what happens. The tape that is sent to the Library of Congress is not converted itself. The corrections are made to a copy of the original archive tape -- at least that is what I have understood so far. I am hoping to make sure that I have got all of this correct.

At the Library of Congress, the tape is converted to the U.S. MARC format, which is different from the OCLC MARC format. The U.S. MARC and OCLC MARC are bibliographic exchange formats which are defined sets of fields and codes that are used for the electronic transmission of bibliographic data. OCLC MARC is based on the MARC format, but there are differences. For example, the 001 field and OCLC MARC is the OCLC record number. In U.S. MARC, it is the LC card number.

The result of this is that the GPO tapes are processed by LC to convert from OCLC MARC to U.S. MARC, and essentially it goes through two conversion processes. It goes through an internal processing format and then it goes through a conversion program to convert it to U.S. MARC.

Some fields in the OCLC tape, the archive tape from GPO, are stripped out during this process at the Library of Congress, and some are left in that probably ought to be stripped out. So you see we have got sort of a confusing issue here when we really do not know what is really happening. This processing scenario, as I have just described it, has been pieced together, again from telephone conversations, with people at GPO and the Library of Congress. In talking to both sets of people, I have found out there is a great deal of uncertainty about this process.

The Library of Congress says it is not sure that the tape they received from GPO is an exact duplicate of the OCLC archive tape. The people I have talked to here at GPO say that they feel like there may be some data missing because they do not know exactly what happens when LC starts putting the tape through the various processing programs.

It seems clear that people from both areas, from the GPO and the Library of Congress, who are really knowledgeable in the tapes, should get together and sit down and talk about these various transformations, field by field if necessary.

In essence, what I am asking is that they create the second part of the technical documentation, that will, again, allow us to know what that field format is like and how we can go about loading these tapes in our on-line systems.

One thing we always have to keep in mind in working with the GPO tapes is that the primary purpose originally of these tapes was to produce a magnetic tape of the bibliographic records for GPO, so that they could produce the Monthly Catalog. As librarians have grown in sophistication, we have asked for the tapes to be available for us to make these applications, now that we are having to ask again to make sure that we have the documentation that will allow us to create on-line systems based on the bibliographic records created by GPO.

That is what I am asking Council to do, is to urge GPO and the Library of Congress to create this technical documentation that we need.

One further comment I would like to make is that there is a test tape available from the Library of Congress for $105.00. There is one caution about this test tape, so you can see whether or not it will suit your system, is that it is a snapshot. It is only one block of records for a particular time. It is not representative of an entire file from 1976 to the present, so you may load the test tape very easily, come to load the entire file, and you run into problems. So, again, this is something that the technical documentation would really help us to avoid.

MS. SMITH: You are all totally confused at this point? That is why I said she understands this stuff. Are there any questions for Carolyn, general questions?

DR. VEATCH: Yes, I have got one. It seems that there must be some technical documentation somewhere. The GPO must know what their own tapes look like, or LC must know, somebody there must know what they are doing to these tapes. What really does exist? Do you have any idea?

MS. JAMISON: My understanding is -- and I have talked to people at LC about this -- when you subscribe to the GPO tapes, you are given a copy of the MARC formats for bibliographic data, which is their standard documentation for the MARC tapes. It goes field by field, exactly what is supposed to be in the MARC format. You also receive two memos which are a total of three pages on exceptional practices, that have been used by the Government Printing Office. As far as I know, that is all that you are sent when you subscribe to the tapes.

DR. VEATCH: What I mean is there has got to be something in somebody's desk, right?

MS. JAMISON: I hope so. That is essentially what I am asking for, to get Council to urge GPO to go back and look at when they began using a particular field and publish it in a format that we can use and say this is what it is.

DR. VEATCH: It would not seem like this is something that has to be written totally from scratch. It is just get them to put it together in a usable form and give it to us, which does not seem all that unreasonable to me.

MS. SMITH: Are there any other comments?

A PARTICIPANT: Do you know of any libraries who have tried to load the GPO tapes into an on-line catalog system that they have? I guess I am addressing Carolyn.

MR. HORDUSKY: I am Clyde Hordusky, State Library of

Ohio. In cooperation with Ohio State University, we have loaded the GPO tapes into our On-Line Catalog. We admit that we have problems. The tapes were loaded using the item number. Fortunately, I am a regional, which takes care of a lot of problems.

The tapes for 1976 and 1977 went through quite fast because the item numbers in most cases were not where they were supposed to be. We have loaded up through October 1984 and have, unfortunately, run out of disk space, but they said that is a temporary problem. One thing that I have noticed is our system, the way it is designed, has created problems for us.

The term "flood insurance" currently has something like 8,000 records when you have used that for a title search. The Congressional Record, each part of each of the bound volumes has its own individual record. The changes and the transmittal sheets have records, at least until they stopped putting them on the tape. Fortunately, with our system we can go in and do some cleanup of the records in our own system.

We have not gone into the GPO tapes and tried to clean them up ourselves. Our next step is to go through and take and look at all the series, our serial records, to see if we can make some sense out of that. We are in the process of writing a report to the State Librarian and to the Director of Ohio State University, making various recommendations to them, and that report has not been completed. But we know we have problems and we have had to make some adjustments.

One of our key indicators in the system is the slash or shilling mark. We cannot use that as it appears on the GPO tapes. We have substituted a plus sign. But I have found that the use of the documents has shot up drastically. We are loaning more of our material up to the University than we ever did before. The students are coming down. The Reference Department is using it for searching. I have access both to an OCLC terminal, as well as our internal system, and I find it a definite plus. It also helps in sending out overdues. It does it automatically, and we can put reserves, or "saves" as we call them, on a publication.

MS. SMITH: Bob.

MR. WALTER: I was wondering, Carolyn, could you indicate what type of subfields that GPO uses in the 536 field and other than in the mark format?

MS. JAMISON: According to this memo that I have seen, it is in the 536 field, and they use it -- it is subfield H and I, I believe, I am not sure about the exact designations -- but it is used for serial set information. Again, I should have brought it with me, but did not do it, but that is what they are using. I believe it is on the subfields that are defined on the A, B, and C, but I am not sure about that either, how far down it goes. It is subfields that have not been defined, but they are pretty far down in the alphabet before it is likely that they would be defined in the MARC tapes. It is just that it is one of those things that happen.

MS. SMITH: Other comments from Council?

(No response.)

MS. SMITH: From the audience?

A PARTICIPANT: I am Susan Dow, Suny Buffalo. I have a question for you. In loading the tapes, are you using your own computer system, or are you going through a vendor? Are you ever going to have an integrated system? The other question is, is there any material that you catalog on OCLC and then load the tapes, and do you have a problem, then, with duplicate records and one writing out the other record?

One of the problems we are trying to work in this area, and one of the problems we are having is that we have one library that catalogs documents, and if we load tapes, we are going to overwrite the tapes that are already in there, or end up with dual records for the same item. Have you run into any of that problem at all?

MR. HORDUSKY: The University receives about 65 percent of the materials offered. They classify a lot of their materials into LC classification. We used SuDocs strictly and we have a shared record for that. The LC classification does not appear. What will happen is, it will say "may be at Ohio State University", also, check with their Documents Department, because they will do all the necessary work for the person.

The tapes are entered into the University system itself.

A PARTICIPANT: Susan Dow. You are not using anything like a GEAC or an integrated system?

MR. HORDUSKY: No, it is their own main frame.

A PARTICIPANT: Thank you.

MS. SMITH: Other comments?

(No response.)

MS. SMITH: Thank you, Carolyn, very much.

GPO has asked Council for a recommendation in relation to the Monthly Catalog, the new format for the Monthly Catalog. As you will recall, the last Council meeting, we approved -- or the one before -- we approved a certain format to the Monthly Catalog, which would be expanding the physical item itself, and it would allow one look-up. GPO has gone through the specifications of what would result if they go with this recommendation, and they would like to present us with the results of that specification and get our reaction to it.

Mark, are you going to do it? Visual aids seem to be very helpful in discussing this, so what we will do is have a presentation -- a picture is worth 1,000 words -- have a presentation and then you can think about it during break.

MR. SCULLY: I will give you a little background while Sally is getting her notes together, and so forth. Our concern has to do with the new proposed format of the Monthly Catalog in Calendar Year 1986.

As you know, there had been a good bit of discussion, deliberation within Council, GODORT, and other organizations and groups over what the proper format, the best format for all parties should be for the Monthly Catalog. Now, you know that the Monthly Catalog is comprised of two basic parts, the first being the register portion, which is really a listing of the catalog record entries, just in agency sequence. The second part is a series of seven indexes, author, title, subject, title key word, series report contract number, stock number, classification number, all these seven indexes.

The proposal we received from the Depository Council -- and it was more or less concurred in by the GODORT people -- was to achieve a one-step look-up arrangement, whereby we would keep the same seven indexes, but add, that is, expand the content, the number of data fields within each index entry to enable the casual library user to go and find enough information, by consulting the index, so that they would not have to go to the register portion for the full catalog entry. So you can make it simple. That was the purpose, make it simple and usable for the casual user of the Monthly Catalog.

Well, that was the plan and we have been gearing up and preparing and consulting with our data systems people, and others here in GPO, to make that happen. Well, we encountered a snag that causes us some concern, and we brought it yesterday to the Council, the new Council people, the Chair and Chair-Elect, and told them this was a concern.

Essentially, it is this. If we go ahead with the seven indexes expanded for each entry, as planned, for one-step lookup, we are going to essentially double the size of the Monthly Catalog and possibly price it out of reach of the common small public library and other libraries, and other members of the public who will not be able to afford it.

There are other consequences, but that is one. It will be difficult to manage. Physically, it will be, what, doubled in size, would you say, Sally?

MS. McLEAN: It will go from this size, January, to this size. (Indicating.)

MR. SCULLY: Now, the figures you see on the screen are actual numbers of pages. They are not real legible, because of the lighting in this room on the screen, but let me say this. The title key word index currently occupies some 51 pages in a given issue, say, a typical issue of the Monthly Catalog.

Under the one-step lookup proposed format, by expanding the content of each entry in the title key word index, it will go from 51 pages, under current format, to 328, 6.5 times the size. In the case of the stock number index, the ratio is 1 to 6, so it will increase by sixfold; contract number, threefold increase; the series report number, 4.3 times the size. So you see that we are going to have a substantial increase if we proceed according to plan.

One issue of the Monthly Catalog, that is, the July issue, under the proposed plan, would increase to such a degree that it will be about the size of the semiannual index. Sally just held up -- that is over double, isn't it?

Ms. McLEAN: Yes.

MR. SCULLY: Over double the size. So this is what concerns us. It is the volume of it. Now, there are some -- do you want to get into options, or do you have more horror stories to tell -- fine, let's look at the sales consequences.

This is a picture -- again, I will relate it to you because I know it is difficult for you to see it. Going back and tracing the subscription price, that is, the paper hard copy subscription, from January 1980 until September 1985, it goes something like this: 1980, $65.00 a year; later in 1980, it increased to $80,00 per year; 1981, to $90,00 per year; 1982, to $125.00 per year; 1983, to $215.00; and it stayed pretty stable at that point, where it is now at $217.00.

At the same time, the number of subscribers has been constantly on a downward slide. The number of subscribers in January 1980, 8,435. Again, the trend is downward. In 1981, 7,600. I am rounding them off. In 1982, 6,400; in 1983, 5,200; in 1984, 3,200; in 1985, 2,700. So you can see that the trend is clear. Now, we understand there have been some commercial products on the market that have had something to do with this. Our own microfiche alternative, I am sure has had somethingto do with this. The availability on-line of the Monthly Catalog has probaby cut into that market, too. We understand those things. But that has been the trend, nonetheless. So, as of September, last month, there were only 2,726 subscribers to the hardcopy Monthly Catalog subscription and 913 subcribers to the microfiche.

So that is where we are at now and our concern is that if we were to go ahead with the plan under the new 1986 proposed format, that will undercut the market, wipe it out, basically. I am not with the Sales Service, but I know that that is their concern, as Mr. Fossedal has expressed.

MS. McLEAN: The register, of course, will stay the same. The author index and the enhanced format. The author index went from 41 to 59 pages. The title index went from 18 to 56 pages. The subject index went from 60 to 79 pages. The series report went from 7 to 30 pages. The contract number went from 1 to 3 pages. The classification number went from 0 to 34 pages. The stock number went from 1 to 6 pages. The title key word went from 51 to 328 pages.

If you have a Congressional publication, like a House report, and you have one of those -- it is not like the Defense Appropriation bill, but it is something like (avoiding) the conveyancing of land in Southern New Mexico to four Indian tribes. Everything is spelled out in that and each term is indexed, so if you have 30 items in a title, each one is indexed in the title key word index, not the "of's" or the "the's" in the stock word list, but any of the major words, so it just increases proportionately.

MR. SCULLY: Are you ready to go on to options, or do you have more examples? All right. Let me read -- again, it is hard for you to read, I will announce it from here. We see three reasonable options. That is not to suggest that these are the only options. These are just three that happen to make sense to us, but we encourage you to do some expansive thinking, some creative thinking, and that is why we are here in this open forum.

Option one would be to produce the Monthly

Cataloging, the indexes, in the format requested by the Depository Library Council, establish the four subscriptions to sell the indexes and registers separately in both the paper and microfiche formats.

Now, this is the proposal that is on the table now, the suggestion that would result in essentially doubling the size of the Monthly Catalog. The advantage to this option is that it satisfies the request of Council and basically GODORT's intention, I think. The disadvantage is that it would, as Sally has demonstrated, basically double the size of the Monthly Catalog, expand it very, very substantially and probably price it out of the market in real terms. That is one option.

Option two is to print the author, title, subject, series report, contract number, stock number, and classification number indexes in the new format, that is, the expanded one-step lookup format which displays title, date of publication, stock number, item number, SuDocs, class number and Monthly Catalog entry number under each index term.

However, print the title key word index in its current format, in the old format without the expanded entry, so you would not have the one-step lookup under the title/key word index, and then thereby, you avoid that 6.5-fold increase in that particular index, because that is the prime violator, if you will.

Again, you would offer both the register and the indexes in both the paper and the microfiche formats.

The advantage to this option is that the size of the Monthly Catalog would increase approximately 50 percent rather than the 100 percent or doubled increase of the first option. The disadvantage? Well, it would not offer the one-step lookup from the title/key word index.

Option three is to print the Monthly Catalog in its current format, without the one-step lookup. We are talking status quo there.

Those are the three that make sense to us and are live options, but we encourage open thinking and we welcome any suggestions.

MS. SMITH: Yesterday, when we were discussing this, when you brought it to us, we sort of covered a couple of points. One thing that Sally had mentioned was that when you start discussing the possibility perhaps of producing only parts of the index and paper versus parts of the index and fiche, you are not really alleviating the problem as far as the cost factor. Am I correct in that? So I think in our open and creative thinking, you have to take that into consideration. There is additional programming that has been necessary.

The second thing, Mark, that you mentioned was -- I know there are a lot of people who have already received the survey that dealt with this -- you are considering, based on the recommendation of Council, resurveying or at least resurveying because of confusion with that, are you not?

MR. SCULLY: Yes, absolutely.

MS. SMITH: All right. Third, all Council members have copies of these pages in their notebooks. Anyone who would like to take a look at them during break, I am sure we would all be more than willing for you to take a look.

I would like, at this point, to stop the conversation, take a break for 15 minutes. We will reconvene at five of 3:00 to discuss this. Have lots of creative thinking in the interim.

(A short recess was taken.)

MS. SMITH: The GPO has now laid bare their soul to us and asked us our advice to them. I have also been informed that the people that are here right now from USGS, who would like to discuss the Maps Depository Program, have to leave by 4 o'clock. So I would like to discuss, until at least 3:30, if we can hold the discussion that long, what to do with the Monthly Catalog, and at 3:30, the people from USGS, who would like to talk to us about the Maps Depository Program.

Susan, did you have a question?

MS. TULIS: My question was whether or not they had come up with any price figure at all in the expanded version, paper and microfiche.

MS. SMITH: Have you come up with general idea of what the price would be for the Monthly Catalog if it were expanded to its full extent?

MR. FOSSEDAL: If it doubles in size, it will more than double in price, I would say, because of the formula that we now have, which shows per square inch per page. Suffice to say if it goes from 217 now, what is the difference if it goes to 434 or 537? You are going to have the same basic. It is going to have a mega-impact on the price; 100 percent increase is conservatively what it will be.

So if you want to go 132 percent and play with all those number games, it is going to go up at least double, I would say.

MS. JACOB: What kind of a difference is it going to make with Option two? Do you have any idea how Option two would come out?

MR. FOSSEDAL: No, I do not. To do this right we would have to bring the Pricing people over here. We are going to go through a great big drill and it is going to be $514.00 versus $407.00. You are going to get into all kinds of demand curves. I think the options and prices in the general magnitude of what we are doing speak for themselves without getting into a great big numbers game here.

MS. JACOB: The other thing, it looks to me as if you could save some space -- looking at the layout of it -- by running lines on, but I personally think it is a monster and I think it is going much too far to do all these. I just hate the idea of creating something that is going to make it impossible for small libraries to buy it and use it. But I do think you could save some space running things together.

MS. SMITH: Bob?

MR. WALTER: I think you can probably make a number of changes here that would decrease the size of it. In fact, I would be very much in favor of several. One point I would like to make, however, if you do make this product a much more useful product, you very well may regain some of the sales you have lost to some of the private sector. If you do various combinations, such as the price is not double, but the product is much more useful to especially the smaller libraries that have purchased it in the past, you very well may gain in sales, and not lose, especially if you come up with some way to break various parts of this down.

MS. SMITH: Kathleen.

MS. EISENBEIS: I had the benefit of being in the office yesterday and seeing this presented for the first time. I think a lot of us are kind of worn down today and as I think about it and talk about it, I hate to miss the arguments that were presented yesterday and I hate to go into all the questions that I have since I have thought about it today. What I would like to suggest is that we take the time and bring up some of the issues, but delay it, so that we can think about it, because every time I have discussed it with people since yesterday, something else has come up.

I have a question that I think people in the audience might be able to answer because of the collective memory of this group, and that is, I remember being almost a first-time Council attendee, that the title/key word index was brought to us in the Monthly Catalog and presented as a programming problem that was not an index program; that this key word index was generated from some other kind of a program so we don't have a true keyword index but almost a bastardized index produced from something that was not intended to do a subject approach.

Does anyone remember what it was?

(No response.)

Nobody? I can't believe that.

We have a keyword index that historically we had with the '76 Monthly Catalog. We have an index that was not a true subject, close to a keyword/title. Is there a possibility of reworking the programming so that we could again combine the subject index with a title approach, if only with the use of local fields, so we can make it one index that has local subject headings which, in fact, could be titled, eliminate some of the duplication.

A PARTICIPANT: Jeannie Isacco, OCLC:

I do remember that. What the Council asked for was exactly what you just said, local subject headings added into a local field. The Government Printing Office answer, at the time, was that it would increase the workload by some tremendous amount and all those big nice words that we keep hearing, tremendous, big -- a lot yes.

So, therefore, this computerized answer was the best way of doing it. It is my memory that the Council reluctantly agreed that given the magnanamous -- what the word? The huge effort, magnitude, of the manual effort that the automated answer was a better one.

You are correct in your memory of why the keyword index came about.

MS. EISENBEIS: Is there any way to pursue looking at the subject keyword as a new animal rather than this monster that we have, which is taking up all this space?

MS. SMITH: Can anyone from GPO answer that?

MS. McLEAN: We are open to suggestions. The options we have given you are so that the '86 production run can run.

Another option is: We run it as it is for the periodicals in the January through June issue and then reimplement whatever you come up with for the July issue, so that we have six more months to play with it to get it more close to what you would like.

MS. SMITH: Jeannie?

A PARTICIPANT: Jeannie Isacco, OCLC.

I really appreciated the analysis done on the paper index. My question: Was the same kind of analysis done on the microfiche product? To me, that seems like it is the obvious answer to just not deal with increasing the paper, but to deal with increasing the microfiche product.

MS. EISENBEIS: I think yesterday we got the answer that we cannot do them separately, there cannot be a paper different than fiche. Is that what you are saying, Jeannie?

MS. SMITH: Or are you saying, produce it only in fiche?

MS. EISENBEIS: Produce it only in fiche or have the same product?

MS. ISACCO: Yes. All of that analysis was great and I would like to see the same kind of analysis on the microfiche product. It just seems to me that to do this in paper is not even worth considering, but to do it in microfiche might be very much worth considering and it might be a very do-able product.

MS. EISENBEIS: And loosing the paper?

MS. ISACCO: Is that a great loss?

MS. EISENBEIS: No, but that is what you are saying?

MS. ISACCO: Yes.

MS. SMITH: Bernadine?

MS. HODUSKI: Well, first of all one of the things I had asked for and I don't think it was ever done, was a real survey of all of the Monthly Catalog customers as to what it is that they want.

Also, I belive that as far as the pricing goes, that you cannot just think of it as doubling and that doubles the price. If you buy the register in fiche and the index in paper, you may buy one set of the register and five sets of the index. That is going to be a different pricing mechanism.

You should not base the idea that the price is going to be on the total Monthly Catalog package because you don't know what the customer is going to buy as far as the mix or the number of what sections. The plan, as it was presented, is good as it was presented on your survey, broken up into different parts.

You don't really know what the customers are going to want out there, the Monthly Catalog people who buy it.

Also, there are intentions by others of reducing the register in paper or the index in paper. We have already seen that happen with the five year cumulation.

The other consideration is that the keyword index information does not appear in the automated product, it never has. I remember the subcommitee of the Depository Library Council bibliography group, who were devastated when Council went ahead and accepted GPO's recommendation against their recommendation, which they debated over for three years, about adding the local subject headings.

The keyword index was never anything designed for permanent retention. It is not going to be used in the future.

The sales -- you can see that the sales are getting diversified products. They are not just going to the traditional Monthly Catalog, which we all knew was going to happen ten years ago when we decided to automate it.

That is why you have to look at the new products. We have a database so we can produce various products from it. I think it's crazy to base a decision based on the fact that it is going to have double the number of pages, or whatever.

Look at the product and is that going to serve the users.

MS. SMITH: Barbara?

A PARTICIPANT: Barbara Smith, Skidmore College. I think there are a lot of issues here.

I, for one, cannot visualize getting that package and finding a space to house it. I think that has to be discouraged.

Rather than making the decision now or delaying for six months, I would rather look at some other alternatives a year from now. I would not want to see us split something in July and obviously any decision we make now (inaudible) -- is going to be a informal decision at best.

I think we should consider delaying it and looking for some alternatives and having those alternatives discussed at the next meeting.

A PARTICIPANT: Steve Hayes, University of Notre Dame.

First of all, I am not sure that the Depository Library Council should be making this choice. There are, 1400 or 1300 of us. There are over 2000 subscribers, if I read the chart correctly. I subscribe to four additional copies, but somehow I can't see 1400 of us subscribing to -- you know.

So, I think, indeed, as Bernadine said, we are going to have to look or get the people who are purchasing this, since that is who we are really considering here. The depositories do not pay for it so we really should not care how much it is going to charge. It is not a key item for us.

In terms of -- we at least get one copy. I don't think it should be the overriding issue for a depository librarian.

Options are the key thing. Unless JCP has given up its grand idea that all those DOE fiche are going to be in Monthly Catalog as well as all the other products like the new definitions that are going out to the federal agencies. You know we are taking about a huge catalog here. So, the option of producing microfiche has to be a realistic one regardless of whether it comes from a paper copy first in order to reduce it to microfiche, we need a micro-format copy.

From a marketing point of view, I would hope that -- keep both copies. Call one the Abridged Monthly Catalog and the other one Monthly Catalog. If it worked for Index Medicus to give them the option for small libraries to purchase whatever they could afford to purchase -- you may find that you want to go back to the old indexing that pre-'76.

I am sure that a lot of public libraries thought that dictionary index was just wonderful. I think you want to keep your options open. I don't really see this group saying, "No, we want option one only", and you produce a one-step look-up type of a thing or you don't produce anything. I think from a marketing point of view we want that, you want the paper issue available for those who only want to buy the unenhanced one. You want the enhanced one available in paper for those libraries who can afford to buy three copies of the enhanced one.

I don't think you really want to limit yourself by saying it is going to double the price so let's not even consider doing it. Five years down the road you might find, from a marketing point of view, that you cannot do this anymore. Okay, we have made those types of decisions in the past and I am sure we can do it five years from now, but let's not do it now with nothing to look at or not even trying it first.

MS. YUKAWA: CWPost, Long Island University.

It would be very nice to have one-step look-up, however (inaudible) who cannot afford to spend the dollars. I think it is very (inaudible). Here we are trying to educate the public (inaudible). Who can afford to buy a copy (inaudible) a small library. Therefore, my clientele cannot even have a (inaudible).

DR. VEATCH: If I were going to be doing a marketing casebook, I think I would look at what has happened to the Monthly Catalog. Here you have a basic reference tool and over five years you have lost half your subscribers. I am wondering if this has been done? I wonder if GPO knows what has happened to those subscribers and is interested in doing a market analysis in terms of what is going to happen to the Monthly Catalog as a sales item if some of these things come about.

I think that we really do need to look at the problems of the people who buy it. Now, I realize that there is a necessity for a good reference tool. We thought at one time we had a fairly good reference tool, but a lot of people are not buying it anymore. Are they buying something else or are they just saying, "We will do without." Where did these people go? Where have these 4000 users gone?

I think this is the key to it. I know we need good reference stuff. I know we need it in the depository library. We talk about price for the depository libraries and we talk about 500 hundred dollars for a Monthly Catalog? I am not a depository librarian, but don't you all spend more than that on other reference tools?

I don't think the price is that much of a factor for you. Sure, you would like to have it as cheaply as possible if you are buying extra copies. It is the people who are only buying who I think that you really need to consider.

MS. SMITH: Other council?

Lynn Walshak, Georgia Southern College: The Monthly Catalog is one of my best friends. I use it constantly.

MS. SMITH: Excuse me, could you please change mikes? That one seems to be totally dead. We aren't picking up what you are saying. Thank you.

Lynn Walshak, Georgia Southern College: I rely very heavily upon the Monthly Catalog. I use it constantly. Most of my patrons, the students or undergraduate students that we do subject searches for, and I will speak up for that title/keyword index also because we rely very heavily upon it. I would like to see a one-step lookup for certain indexes.

I rely very, very heavily on subject, title and title/key word for student use for the most part. Of course, ultimately, I use all of these indexes for various types of searching.

I am wondering, as Dr. Veatch was talking about what has become of these other purchasers, if an analysis were to show that a lot of these were some of these better funded research libraries who have gone to the more sophisticated opportunities, maybe they are the ones who were buying copies before and no longer need to. I don't know if that is a question or not.

I certainly do want to support that the Monthly Catalog be continued and given thought to at least some of these indexes be expanded with the one-step lookup because it could be very useful.

I try constantly to teach our students to use these indexes independently and competently on their own. They are intimidated, very often, by the the fact that they have to go from one to another to another. They are ill at ease with this. I think a one-step lookup would be very helpful in that respect.

More sophisticated students, graduate students and more mature researchers, perhaps, would not have the same feeling and could do with less indexes with one-step lookup. I am not sure but what -- because everybody might want their indexes expanded also, but perhaps the series, the report numbers and the contract numbers could be eliminated.

I certainly would urge that the Monthly Catalog be studied with one-step lookup given considerable thought to --

continued to be thought about. I certainly support the Monthly Catalog. I have not been one of the complainers about the Monthly Catalog. It is too much my friend as it is.

A PARTICIPANT: Tom Lindsey, Texas Tech University.

I know that GPO produces other indexes such as NASA's Star and the Energy Research Abstracts which have expanded indexing. It seems to me that their indexing has remained fairly stable over a period of years, and the kinds of indexes.

I wonder if they have ever approached GPO and asked for the kind of expanded indexing we have and come back and said, "No, that is too expensive for us especially since we are giving away a lot of copies through exchange, overseas, something like that."

Or, if they have not done it, I ask GPO, if any of these institutions say, on their own internally, and then come back to you and said, "By the way, we talked about asking you to index every keyword, but we found it was just too expensive."

MR. SCULLY: Tom apprached me at the break and suggested this. I think it is a good thought, that is, asking whether any other institutions or publishers, private or public, have taken a look at the formats of their secondary tools, their indexes, abstract conservices, in a similar way as we are looking at Monthly Catalog now.

Let me ask, is Liz Buffome from the Department of Energy here?

(No respnse)

MR. SCULLY: I was hoping I would get a bail-out on that, but -- Liz being with the Department of Energy, she was supposed to have been here. Maybe tomorrow she can respond to that in terms of the Energy Research Abstracts.

To expand, is there anyone else here from the public or private sector issuing secondary tools who has had that kind of experience, determining the format of the record, the number of field to include, access points and that kind of thing?

A PARTICIPANT: I am Jennifer Angier from the University of Utah's Health Sciences Library and I am the editor of Medoc. Medoc is a computerized idex to government information in the health sciences. We are a depository library and we have a subscriber base of about 400 insitutions.

We have had to wrestle with this problem on and off. Back in '83 we developed a new format for Medoc. At this point we have similar indexes to the Monthly Catalog. One of the things I noted today when someone on Council mentioned earlier, is that there is a lot of white space on the pages.

We were able to reduce our size or actually expand our number of indexes and keep our size fairly constant by stringing things along in a little bit more compressed format.

You probably have much more sophisticated duplication techniques than we use. You can probably use some bold-facing and some different types of type facing for different elements within each of the records. I think that would probably serve the purpose.

What I was going to suggest as an alternative to option four, was a combination of something like that, plus the consideration that our colleague from Georgia Southern mentioned, where only some of the indexes be considered for enhancement. I don't think she meant eliminate the contract or the stock number indexes. I think she just meant, and perhaps I am speaking for her incorrectly, but she just meant not to enhance those particular indexes and consider some of the others that are used more, expecially for subject searching.

MS. EISENBEIS: Another thing that we might consider is looking again at the elements that are in each entry in the title, keyword and the subject. Myself, I tend to look at it as a librarian and then from a user's point. Trying to teach people how to use the Monthly Catalog, the number of elements in that enhanced one-step lookup -- we might not need all of them.

I would suggest, from a user's point of view, the item number is not necessary. From a librarian's point of view, we can look at the information in the enhanced index and go back to the register for that item number.

I think it would be very hard to even look at that one-step entry and teach the patron how to use that item number. So, why don't we consider dropping that out and see what difference it would make.

A PARTICIPANT: I am Julie Wallace from Minneapolis Public Library.

We are really dealing with some awfully complex issues here. Clearly, it is not going to get settled today. I would have to say that if I were a Council member I would certainly not be prepared to make a recommendation right at this point, but it harkens back to several of the things that have come up earlier in the day in dealing with long-range and semi-long range.

I think in the really long-range, this is going to solve itself through new kinds of technologies and new uses of this information. In the medium-range, how does this relate to the new ways in which these tapes are being used, or the Monthly Catalog data is being used. We have talked about that much of it is now being used in forms other than the paper indexes, anyway the Monthly Catalog on-line and as we have said the tapes --as the problems get solved of loading these into people's own on-line catalogs more and more people will have access that way rather than through the paper indexes.

Also, of course, the privatization of the Monthly Catalog had affected a lot of us, including my library. So, I think what needs to be looked at a little more is what we call a market study. That is, who really is going to be the audience for the Monthly Catalog as it is produced by the GPO and particularly in sales products of paper and microfiche, is this specifically going to be -- the libraries who are so small that they are never going to be able to get the enhanced products from the private firms? I think there are three now available from private companies.

How many of the purchasers really are depositories? I don't buy four extra copies, but I buy one. However, I am about to drop it because I am getting one of the enhanced products which I will now use as a substitute for my second subscription.

In looking at the enhanced product that is being discussed today, it does not serve the purpose that the enhanced product that I buy does. So, no matter what you do, in terms of the way you are talking today, I am not going to drop the subscription that I have from a private company. Instead, I am going to drop my second Monthly Catalog and keep just my depository one.

So, how can we improve it to meet the needs of those who are going to use this particular product, as opposed to just correcting the tapes and things to make it more useful for the on-line and technological products?

MS. SMITH: Anyone else from Council?

MS. JACOB: It just comes down again to, we just don't know who is getting it, who is buying it.

A PARTICIPANT: Francis Buckley, Detroit Public

Library.

I seem to recall from my collective historical memory, that one of the reasons for this suggestion was not just the one-step lookup feature, but also the perspective that a reduced tool that these enhanced indexes could comprise in and of themselves, would be a satisfactory tool for smaller libraries who might not need the whole register, for a library and for patrons who just wanted a direct index without complete bibliographic records.

It seems to me that there would be the possibility for multiple product options which Steve was somewhat alluding to, that would be suitable to various types of libraries and users, that would be possible from the range of configurations that you could achieve.

It does not have to be all one thing or all another. I am afraid I think there needs to be more study of the options and better planning and better cost analysis before I would recommend proceeding.

MS. SMITH: At this moment, I would like to recommend, if Council agrees, that we table this discussion at the moment and move on to maps. We will take Kathleen's suggestion to continue our discussion. Is that okay with you all?

(No response)

MS. SMITH: Kathleen, would you like to talk about maps, start the conversation going?

STATEMENT OF KATHLEEN EISENBEIS
REGARDING MAP DEPOSITORY PROGRAM

MS. EISENBEIS: It gives me great pleasure to talk about the Map Depository Program. I have been in other audiences, you may know that I am a member of the Cartographic Users Advisory Committee. That group has worked with the mapping agencies for years. I am now finding that the depository librarians need the same information that the map librarians have had all along.

It is my feeling that if the depository librarians knew what the map librarians knew, we would all be better off. We have two representatives here from U.S.G.S. who have been very fine spokesmen. I am very pleased that they took the time to come.

Would you guys like to give a presentation? You have thirty minutes. Would you please come to the microphone so people can recognize you? Please introduce yourselves. I know you, but I know that everybody else does not.

STATEMENT OF FRANK OUSLEY

U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

MR. OUSLEY: My name is Frank Ousley. I am chief of the office of Product Distribution Policy at the U.S. Geological Survey. Charlie Bennett of my staff is here as well. Charlie manages our indexing program and the day-to-day activities of the Map Depository Library Program.

What all of that means is when credit is due, I usually get it for this program at higher level staff meetings and Charlie does all the work.

You could not tell it from my present physique, but I am a veteran marathon runner. Somewhere along the years of doing this, I read in one or more of the running magazines that a well conditioned human being that can run that distance, can generally outrun most animals, not all of them, but most, but including bears.

I was thinking about that, but decided not to pursue it for my instincts told me that it would be best to take the approach of my good friend, Mark Scully's childhood neighbo

and simply walk quietly.

In all seriousness, I would like to deal with the issue of shipping lists for map depository sendings right up front and then stay here and be available for any other questions that any of you might have on this program.

We, the Geological Survey, have been furnishing maps to libraries for, I think, well over a hundered years. That is far longer than any of our current files can seem to indicate. Several years ago, under the direction of Bernadine Hoduski of the JCP, a major consolidation program was initiated to combine what we were doing and what the Defense Mapping Agency was doing and to canvas the entire depository library network to determine which of those institutions would like to begin receiving maps in the future.

The long and short of it is, during the decades of the Survey sending maps, both topographic and phematic to the library community, we never had any formal shipping lists or any formal procedures for claims. We simply sent the maps out and if for whatever reason, somebody did not get them, they would write or call in and we would send them what they said they didn't get. So, we did not have a mechanism or the data processing support to generate shipping lists.

In the interim, we have a somewhat convoluted method whereby, along with GPO, we are doing kind of a halfway job of generating shipping lists. It was recognized that this was insufficient and that if we were going to be part of the overall GPO program that we would have to begin sending shipping lists in the future. So, roughly a year ago or longer, we launched an heroic attempt to do this.

At the ALA meeting in Chicago, I had to stand before several hundred people and tell them that our mission failed, as of that time, largely because we acquired two new sophisticated computer systems for our distribution facilities and that we were having trouble fulfilling everyday orders for maps.

I also told them that it was my intention not to have to get up at the next ALA session and give the same excuses. So, what we have done, is we have done most of the software development necessary to do the generation of shipping lists and I talked to the person in charge of that area early this morning. He assures me that by January 30, 1986, we will be able to generate shipping lists.

That is what I reported to ALA, but I realize there are different audiences and I realize some of you were not there so I thought I would go through that just as an introduction.

I would be happy to take any questions on that or any other issue dealing with the U.S.G.S. Map Depository Library Program.

MR. WALTER: As a selective depository that did not previously get maps from U.S.G.S. or the Defense Mapping Agency, I greatly appreciate this new effort. We have been making efforts to publicize the fact that we have the maps. We take a somewhat limited geographically based selection.

One thing in particular concerns me and I know some other people who are kind of new to this map game. I really don't know where the fault lies with U.S.G.S. or with GPO, but since you are both here, maybe I can find out.

A map comes with an index maps to the maps. It is very difficult, especially for we novices, to help people locate seven and a half minute quadrangle maps without an index map. We have not gotten any of the index maps.

I have talked with some of your people at IFLA and they very kindly sent me a whole bunch of indexes for various states that we take and other states that we are intersted in, but still they are not in the system. Do you have any idea where this problem is centered?

MR. OUSLEY: I am not sure I completely understnd your question. What I can say is that we have flat sheet indexes for all topographic maps at all scales and that we are currently in the process of converting to a booklet style index. We have a schedule for that conversion. We anticipate that we will finish coverage of the entire fifty states by the end of 1986.

The way we prioritize the states in which we are working on initially, was we went to our field mapping centers and had them, in turn, contact the various state cooperaters to ascertain which states they wanted to be done first.

MR. WALTER: The problem is, the booklets that you are putting out which are very nice and very helpful are not in the GPO system. We are not receiving them as depository libraries. We are getting the maps, we are not getting your catalog.

MR. OUSLEY: He can answer that, I hope.

MR. BENNETT: Charlie Bennett, U.S.G.S.

The index booklets are in the system. Whenever a new index booklet is prepared, it goes to the library that has selected that state or selected all states. The problem is that not many indexes have come out since last October when the program was incepted.

MR. WALTER: Which states have come out and which will be coming out in the next three months?

MR. BENNETT: There are five states that have come out since last October, Missouri, Kansas, Illinois, Texas and another one.

MR. WALTER: Of the four you named, we select two of those. We have not received from GPO -- I did receive from your office, I have not received from GPO any of those cataloges. Plus, it was my understanding, the way the item selection was made, we would like to have, very frankly, the index map for all states, even though we select the maps themselves from six states.

If someone comes in to me and I am located in Kansas and wants a quad from Vermont, I would like to have that index map so that I would know then that I can inter-library loan that particular map from a map depository.

The way I interpreted the item card was we were selecting the index maps for all states, but regardless, we have gotten none, zero.

MR. BENNETT: That is our distribution problem. We will have to look into that for you. I didn't know that problem existed, but I will.

If you have selected all state indexes through the

GPO Survey, you should get all state indexes. If you did not select any state indexes, you should still get those state indexes for which you get topoquads.

MS. EISENBEIS: But, Charlie, the indexes are not seprately selected, that is --

MR. BENNETT: On the survey they can be.

MS. EISENBEIS: What about the earlier ones if we need earlier indexes, we don't need just the ones that are coming out now? Is there any way we can go back and as just a special project --

MR. BENNETT: Sure, just call us or write.

MS. EISENBEIS: No. (laughter)

MR. WALTER: You are talking to a very small portion of the depository libraries, getting maps.

MR. BENNETT: I realize.

MR. WALTER: Of course, if something went out in Admin Notes that this was available, that might be. Still, it would be very helpful to us -- well, take Okalahoma. You sent me one of the flat ones which I happened to have anyway for Oklahoma previously.

But, still, that would be very helpful in the interim until you do comem out with a new catalog.

MR. BENNETT: Things of nature have been published in such things as WAML. (Western Association of Map Libraries)

MS. EISENBEIS: Different audience, Charlie. This is what I have been talking about for years. You have got a whole new 1400, and that is not a lot of duplication. You are also dealing with the new people. The people you want to reach are the people who do not read those map magazines, that don't read those association bulletins.

MR. OUSLEY: Well, maybe we need to get it into the proper vehicle that reaches this audience. Is it the Admin Notes of GPO?

MS. EISENBEIS: Yes.

MR. OUSLEY: I think Mark, hadn't you offered space in the Admin Notes whenever we felt it would be necessary to communicate something to the depository network relative to the depository program, use that as a medium of communication with the broader depository program?

MR. SCULLY: Yes. We have told the agencies with whom we cooperate, Department of Energy, U.S.G.S., D.M.A., andy of the agencies that our Administrative Notes is their channel to depositories. Any copy they give us, we will publish and distribute to the depository libraries, so it is open. Simply give us copy and we will put it in our newsletter.

MR. BENNETT: Okay, I was not aware of this problem. We can write something up and send it over to Mark.

MS. EISENBEIS: Any other questions from the audience? Council? Did Council have any other questions?

MS. TULIS: Charlie, I know we talked about this on the phone, do you just want to mention the whole problem of the shipping lists for DMA maps?

MR. BENNETT: Yes. U.S.G.S., as you all know, I guess, has had a program for many years as Frank mentioned.

When we went under the new program with GPO, we added GPO's address to our database so that they would get, as the regional gets, they would get everything. From that, they could prepare the shipping lists.

When we took over the DMA program, somehow that fell through the proverbial cracks. The GPO's address was never put in the database to receive DMA maps. Therefore, the libraries have received a lot of DMA maps that GPO has not. Therefore, GPO has not generated mailing lists.

We have addressed that. We have identified all of the maps that were missed and we have asked DMA to make the sendings because we don't maintain stocks. So, at some point in the near future GPO will get those DMA maps and we will make shipping lists up for them.

Those were maps that were -- since the beginning of the program very few have gotten into shipping lists. Those only got in manually.

MS. EISENBEIS: I have been told that some of the DMA maps that were received by the DMA depositories have not been sent out yet, like JOG 1501's.

MR. BENNETT: The only reason I can say that if they have not been sent out is because we have not gotten them from DMA.

MR. OUSLEY: They are not sitting on our floor because our warehouse cannot deal with that.

MS. EISENBEIS: I don't know that all of the documents --

MR. OUSLEY: One of --

MS. EISENBEIS: -- realize how you have to communicate with DMA. We have got such a big little --

MR. OUSLEY: There is a slight problem that it has recently emerged -- not a problem, but something we need to close the loop with DMA.

Charlie got a call from a DMA staff member who advised us that Jim Ivey and most of our other DMA working crew, Ray Lawyer, have all retired and that there is a person here who has this responsibility, but we suggested that it might be time for all of us to get back together. "All of us" being GPO, DMA, USGS and make sure there is not any slippage in attention paid to this program. That is as recent as yesterday.

MS. EISENBEIS: Are there any other questions from the audience?

A PARTICIPANT: Maureen Harris, Clemson University.

Considering the problems that have come up, and I am among the libraries with some DMA maps that we don't know what to do with and so forth, but still, I would just like to ask -- I think at one time there was some reference to NOAA maps being added. I don't know if we should start another agency until we get the present ones cleared up.

Are talks still going on about adding NOAA?

MR. OUSLEY: Yes. I talked to Mark earlier today anticipating that question. Would you like to say a few words or should I?

MR. SCULLY: Over the recent months we have had two meetings, our staff. I have not participated personally, but our GPO staff has met with the NOAA people and have gone over the legal and the technical and logistical concerns and requirements to merge our programs and to begin distributing the National Ocean Survey Charts.

Essentially, it comes down to this, and it is not a new story for us. We encounter this a lot. Technically, procedurally, no problem. We are really to get things moving. We can do it. The question is one of law and reconciling the requirements of Title 44 for the depository program with the procedures and requirements that NOAA sets up.

I just about a month ago submitted a memo to the GPO General Counsel asking for this kind of review to see if these differing requirements, as to retention in the collection and disposition of the maps could be reconciled. As soon as I get a clear go-ahead from our counsel, and I am sure our General Counsel will be in touch with NOAA's on this, once they straighten out their different requirements, then they will give us the go-ahead and we will proceed technically from the library distribution side of things.

So, that is where we are at and we will keep you advised.

Bernadine suggests going into the nature of the problems, somewhat. Well, the primary one that I addressed in the memo to General Counsel, had to do with the retention requirements, that is keeping the document in the collection available, publically.

Of course, as you are aware, the regionals are required to keep them indefinitely and the selectives five years. Well, the retention period is much briefer than that for the NOAA charts, navigational, aeronautical charts. Those are the kinds of differences.

Is there anything else that you had in mind on that score, Bernadine?

There is a sensitivity to these. You know these are navigational charts and they have a lot to do with air safety and nautical safety. We imagine the conceivable situation where an outdated chart might be in a library and consulted and might lead to some unfortunate mishap in the air or on the sea. Those are the kinds of concerns because of the risks and implications. We want to make sure we run this through the lawyers before we proceed and start distributing these charts.

MS. EISENBEIS: Ae there any other questions for USGS while they are here?

(No response.)

MR. OUSLEY: Thank you.

MS. EISENBEIS: Diane, I have other map issues, but not for USGS, so we can do it another time and go on with the rest of it.

MS. SMITH: Okay. We can switch gears one more time and go back to bibliographic control. Just when you thought we had finished talking about the Monthly Catalog, the GPO has presented another issue that deals with the Monthly Catalog. This one is with the quinquennial cumulative indexes, remember those?

To summarize, the issue is: Do we prepare this in microfiche as they did the last time or do we prepare it in paper? Their question to us we have on an overhead.

Again, it is a question of usability versus size. Mark do you want to read it?

MR. SCULLY: The July 1976 through 1980 cumulative indexes for the Monthly Catalog of United States Government Publications, consists of 151 microfiche sheets and occupies one and one half inches of drawer space.

The microfiche sheets approximate 14,580 printed pages. The printed version of this product would fill 15 book volumes and would occupy more than three feet of shelf space. The 1981 through 1985 cumulative indexes should consist of more pages since the contract number and bill number indexes have been added and there has been a greater volume of entries in the catalogues.

What we are saying here is the upcoming 1981 throuh 1985 cumulative index will be even more than the 15,000 page estimate, somewhat more. It is hard for us to tell. You are talking maybe 18,000 printed pages. That might fill 18 book volumes. Our question is: Do you want the 18 book volumes in paper or do you want it to go again in microfiche. What is your recommendation? The last five year cumulative was fiche only.

MS. SMITH: Does anyone on Council wish to comment?

MS. JACOB: I just wonder why are you even considering paper? What went wrong with the microfiche? Wasn't that good enough?

MR. SCULLY: We are producers and we are not consumers here. We try to rely on the marketplace and representatives of the marketplace, which you folks are, to tell us.

I did not mean that to be a flip answer, but we don't know how people use these things as you do. So, we need your advice.

MS. EISENBEIS: I like the fiche. I like the cumulation. I like the availability. I would like headers.

(applause)

MS. SMITH: Are there other comments from Council?

(No response)

MS. SMITH: From the audience?

A PARTICIPANT: Eleanor Chase from the University of Washington.

I have never understood why the fiche was basically a microfiche of a paper product, I would have preferred it to be a COM-fiche instead of having to try to find my way through pages on a fiche.

I think it would have been a lot more useful if they had gone to a COM-fiche product as other indexes have done. I think that we wouldn't mind it so much in fiche, but my library is seriously considering spending 500 dollars to get it in paper so we can use it, because right now, we don't.

A PARTICIPANT: Barbara Hulyk, Detroit Public Library.

I was going to say the same thing. My library is also looking at the cumulative paper index that I believe Oryx is supposed to publish. Obviously, there is a need for those libraries with heavy use to have paper. You can use it in a different way than you can the fiche. The fiche is marvelous and I have used it, but the paper alternative has a lot of value.

It would be interesting to compare your, GPO's costs, with Oryx's cost to do the same thing and whether in size we should address the issue which came up a little earlier and that is all of our light space.

MS. EISENBEIS: How would you use the paper that you are not using the fiche? Just multiple access points?

A PARTICIPANT: Yes.

MS. EISENBEIS: More users to the product at one time?

A PARTICIPANT: Yes.

MR. WALTER: It is kind of interesting in light of the last two commentors. I am in a much smaller library. I personally use the thing five to ten times a day, I think. The only trouble I do have, frankly, is getting the patron to use it. I have to use it in most cases. Some I get educated ot that point, but I find it a highly useful tool and again, aside from the inadvertent ommission of the headers, it is very valuable to us. I like it just the way it is.

MS. HODUSKI: I don't know what year we are talking about that this would actually be published, but I would think that by that time we are going to -- well, it ought to be published on an optical disk or something like that where it would be much more useful than either the paper or the fiche.

I would think it is a little bit too early to be planning about the next five year cumulation. We have options right now if you want to get it out on a disk. There is no reason by GPO cannot produce it that way, to be used on a PC or something.

I don't think you should limit your imagination to what we have done in the past or what has not worked in the past or what has worked in the past.

Also, again, you are complicating it by having the keyword index, which is wonderful for a short period of time, but when you go to cumulating it and when six years ago we talked about -- wasn't the keyword index part of that michrfiche product, cumulated as one of the indexes?

That is a tremendous amount. I don't know exactly if the new cumulation of the indexes will have all of this additional information, but when you go to that next five year "COM" it is is going to be one hell of a keyword section in there with a lot of useless words that nobody is ever going to use, particularly in a cumulative version.

I think you really need to consider, again, the various indexes involved in the Monthly Catalog. I will go on record again, as having opposed the keyword index from the very beginning along with a lot of former Council members and going for the local subject headings. It would be much more useful and cheaper.

We predicted that this problem was going to happen when this thing cumulated, but everyone said it was worth it to do it in the meantime. We would worry about that problem in the future. It sounds to me like what the United States Congress has been doing, putting off things and then all of a sudden at 4:00 o'clock in the morning, there is a decision that has to be made.

MS. SMITH: Mark, do you want to address the question of when?

MR. SCULLY: I would just like to clarify a couple of things that everyone might not be aware of.

First off, the previous cumulative index, that is the

1976 through 1980, was a computer output microform product. It was directly from computer to fiche. There was no paper intermediary. Let me also say that we learned a lot from that go around as to how to prepare microfiche headers. We will do a better job this time on that score.

My second point has to do with the timing of this. Sally informs me that we will be ready to go with this thing for production in December of 1985, so it is before us. We just need to figure out how it is going to go, paper and/or fiche.

MS. CROSS: But, you are saying it would be "COM", this one that you are ready to do in December would be "COM" with the additional knowledge of the headers?

MR. SCULLY: Yes. I also wanted to make the point that the 1st edition was "COM" as well, but we will do a better job with the headers now. That was a problem. We have learned a bit since then.

A PARTICIPANT: Steve Hayes, Notre Dame.

Again, why not both? In the past we have purchased from private companies cumulative title, cumulative subject, cumulative author indexes. If these fifteen volumes are produced in the correct way, I would think from a marketing standpoint, again you may offer to the library community any number of options instead of saying, no we will only produce a 15 volume paper set or no, we will only produce a microfiche format.

That is rather limiting to not only the depositories, but more importantly those other libraries that we want to offer the opportunity of "monthly cataloging" and using government documents.

A PARTICIPANT: Paul Thurston, Broward County Library.

We also have one of the commercially produced clones of the Monthly Catalog so, we are not using the printed product as much. But, I do see the printed index as being very valuable for high school students, people who want to browse. If a student comes into your library and wants to do a paper on drugs and you hand him the microfiche, which most of us do not have at our reference desk, it is very difficult to browse.

Whereas, if you give him the printed product, you can say, well, you can look under marijuana, you can look under drugs, you can look under narcotics, you can look under cocaine, you can look under all these subject headings. You can quickly pull out a volume and flip through it.

Whereas, I think in most cases, that type of patron is very put off by microfiche.

The other thing that I would like to say is that since apparently all of this information, since July 1976 is on-line and available, why not do a ten year cumulatin on fiche and that way, we can throw out our de-headered '76 to '80 cumulation?

MS. EISENBEIS: I had thought about that too, Paul. We think alike.

MS. CROSS: This is something that I asked over ten years ago, and I will ask it again. Maybe it is easier now. I know you have answered it, but this is on the ten-year cumulative, but cumulate one year with two years and then two years with the third year and the third year with the fourth year and you build up.

I know there is more expense there, but could that realistically be done? That is what you are competing with. We are competing with the commercial vender who is going to do a ten year or something of that sort and in microfiche, one of the clones.

MR. SCULLY: It would not be a technical problem to rearrange the frequency of cumulation. Technically, there is nothing in the way. It is more a function of cost and what the market will bear. It's more that question.

MS. CROSS: In fiche?

MR. SCULLY: Oh, in fiche, I see, in fiche.

Yes, that is possible. It would be something of a workload.

MS. CROSS: How much of a workload? Or start thinking about the optical disk. I mean, if you are just going to be storing, you don't have to worry about erasing. You are just storing.

Initially, the gear up cost would probably be a lot, but that is basically --

MR. MORTON: It would be interesting to see how this would stand the test of the new OMB circular.

MR. HORDUSKY: Just for a point of information, what is the reduction ratio that you plan to use or did use on that cumulative index from '76 to '80, and what do you plan to use, the same --

MR. SCULLY: That is the 48-X.

MS. HODUSKI: I don't think you can do the ten year cumulation unless you do the tape clean-up. There were a lot of problems, and you are going to have difficulty merging those ten years unless you do the AACR I and II flips and you do some other corrections.

That was one reason why Sarah was in dispair over that five-year cumulation when it was done. There are problems with that one and it really does need to to be regenerated, but I would not suggest you try to cumulate it in with these five years.

I would suggest that the money put in cleaning up the tapes and then doing a ten-year cumulation if that would serve the customers better, but I don't really want to be supporting and I include GPO and JCP since we have joint responsibility for the Monthly Catalog producing a poor quality product. I would like to see a good quality product.

MS. SMITH: I have a question. Can you, in fact, distribute this into a format and have us select which one we would want, as a depository library? Is that possible, or is it a one choice? Does it have to be one or the other?

MR. SCULLY: No, it seems to me it could be paper and/or fiche. You can have paper, you can have fiche, you can have both.

From our point of view, technically, we can produce anything. Now, the money people -- Don Fossedal and the people who are concerned with funding, they can tell us how much money we can have to do the work. That may factor into it, but we will give you what you what you want, or give the customer what they want.

MS. SMITH: I was just curious because it seems to be a ready reference tool that would fall under SOD-13 as something that couldl not be fiched unless you had made this decision that it would be. Am in incorrect in that?

MR. SCULLY: That is an interesting point.

I don't know how SOD applies to GPO produced publications, that is an intesting point. We are the author, we do what we want sort of thing -- maybe there is something to that. (laughter) We can be as high handed as any other agency. (laughter)

MR. WALTER: Was the five year cumulation on fiche ever offerred as a sales product?

MR. SCULLY: Yes.

MR. WALTER: I wonder if there are any sales people here who could tell us how it sold?

MR. SCULLY: That would be an interesting question. I don't know how it sold.

MS. SMITH: Any other comments?

(No response)

MS. SMITH: Now we can move on to another topic, away from the Monthly Catalog and on to classification.

We, as members of Council, have received a number of letters from people dealing with the issue of classification and what is happening to the Superintendent of Documents Classification System, or the error rate, any number of things in the classification issue.

Would anyone like to begin? Do you wish to discuss this?

(No response)

MS. SMITH: No one on Council wishes to dicuss this? Does anyone in the audience wish to discuss this?

A PARTICIPANT: Barbara Hulyk, Detroit Public Library.

I don't have my communication in front of me, but I think the issue is that GPO has taken on a major change in classification when they made the determination that they would pull the serials out of the series.

What was a problem in the past has been compounded because they don't always have the publication to look at and to check back. Many of the errors I see coming through now are because they don't have a publicatin in front of them.

The classification scheme -- the concept of pulling the serials out of the series I think will meet some needs for libraries in the long run use. But the problems of the corrections that need to be made and the time and the effort that goes into, both at GPO and in the depository system, in making all of these corrections is getting to be rather painful, to say the least.

I don't know what the most efficient way of dealing with the problem -- I have a feeling that perhaps even holding publications for a year in GPO would help an awful lot so that the classifiers have something to look at as they are dealing with the publication.

The example that I sent council, the area -- let's see, it is moving and storage. I forgot that I sent Jennie my best ones. I must say I would like to thank Chris Dyer for being so patient when I call him on the classification hotline. We are getting to be old buddies.

This particular one, the Moving and Storage Wage Survey came out with three different classification numbers. I called Chris and tried to explain to him over the phone what it was that was the problem. Because, apparently, and I am making this assumption, three different people looked at the product, or looked at the publication and interpreted it differently.

When he went to his shelf list he thought he was dealing with three different publications, when I, who had them in front of me, knew they were three identical publications. The only difference being the city in question.

That was one of the problems.

One of the other problems that I was concerned with was, again, where they did not have the product in front of them, we got a series -- let's see. We got a note that a class TD 2.40/4, Bridge Deck Expansion Joints, was added to an item number. When we got it down to our department where the publication was stored, we found out that Bridge Deck Expansion Joints happened to be one of the publications in a series and if you had the publication in front of you, you would see that the series title was "Experimental Projects" with a numbered series.

Again, this was an error specifically because they do not have the publications in hand. I guess my question that I was raising with Council is: Is there some feasible way that even for a short period of time, particularly while they are going through a major change in classification, that they can keep publications on hand?

I think the third one that I had in my concerns was where they are separating the basic volume and the supplements. The supplements are getting reclassified, but the volume to which they are supplementing is still in the old classification number. Perhaps there should be some kind of policy where if you have a supplement you will not change your classification until the next new changed volume comes out.

I think I covered all of them.

MS. SMITH: Thank you.

A PARTICIPANT: Paul Thurston, Broward County Library.

The last survey that came out, not the one that has 38 items on it or whatever, but the one right before that, I think it was 8506, maybe, had a series -- I don't remember the title of it, but it was a VA series.

The classification number given was VA 1.2/2, which is in direct contradiction to GPO's stated policy of saving that monograph of a slash 2 for us to use as locally assigned numbers. I would like for GPO to address this problem and reiterate their statement to save that number for us.

I also would like to see if there is a possibility that there could be another number of block of numbers saved for local classifications, perhaps the Z numbers that are not being used.

We, in our library, are trying to subsume all of our docuemnts into a SuDoc like number and we are using Z, so we have our state, local and international documents in Z numbering. There may be other libraries like that, otherwise you end up with your U.N. documents shelved with your agriculture documents and it becomes quite a mess.

I would like GPO to think about that proposal of reserving a large block of numbers, but also in that particular instance where they did assign a 1.2/2, to hopefully change that and come out with a correction to a survey sheet.

MS. SMITH: Council, comments?

MR. PONCE: The VA 1.2/2, I was not aware of it, but any specific problems that you have like that, bring it to our attention.

The new classification manual has two systems for locally assigned numbers. One of them was proposed by you, Paul, some time ago. It is used when you have a publication that we do not have here, LPS, what we call fugitive publications.

You go through the List of Classes and if there has been a class assigned, you can use that number. You can assign a date, a number series or cutter, whatever applies. At the end you put a slash X.

If you have a publication for which a class has not been assigned, then you go to the general publication which -- it is always going to be point 2, and you have slash 2 through eight reserved, specifically for this problem. Now, when you run out of slashes two through eight to use, you can start using dash 2 through infinity.

So, you have a capability to assign an infinite number of classes. So, the problem has been addressed. A lot of those questions that are dealing with classification have been taken care of in the Classification Manual which you will be getting in the near future.

A PARTICIPANT: (question from the back of the room inaudible.)

MR. PONCE: Like I said, we are recommending two solutions for locally assigned numbers.

All of you have specialized clientele. The two systems that we included in the Classification Manual are not to be taken as exclusive. Anything that works for your library, feel free to use it.

MR. WALTER: Jorge, if I could just follow through on what Paul was saying, I think what he is after is, even if your just designated a ZZ or something that would fall at the end so that non-federal documents, if someone wanted to include those into the SuDoc classification scheme so that all documents were on one classification scheme, that there would be some -- he suggested Z or a double letter.

He is not interested in putting state documents up in the A 1.2/4 or something like that. He would like to have a complete thing which would fall at the end, a ZZ or something, but just declare that that would never be used by GPO.

I can't imagine what agency would ever have a ZZ anyway, but --

MR. PONCE: If you are thinking about state documents, we are only responsible for federal publications. State documents we cannot handle. The two systems that we have included in the Classification Manual, the second one, where you have slash two through 8 reserved, and once you use up those numbers you can use dash two through infinity.

That covers the whole universe. You are never going to run out of numbers.

MR. WALTER: Jorge, one more try.

What we want is a block. What Paul is suggesting is a letter block that would never be used by GPO period. They just would not use that letter or combination of letters. Hopefully, something at the end. That is what he asking for, that GPO would declare that they shall henceforth never use ZZ.

MR. PONCE: I am going to go by Mr. Fossedal's example. I never make any commitments at Council. I will study the issue and see.

MR. SCULLY: Let me follow that up to say we are going to huddle. By tomorrow afternoon's question and answer period, we are going to have something more to say about this. I think we understand the point you are making and we will consider and respond.

MS. SMITH: Are there other comments?

A PARTICIPANT: Francis Buckley, Detroit Public Library. I really would like a response to the questions raised by Barbara Hulyk about the problems of quality control and classification.

I know that GPO had been maintaining a library of the documents for a year or two. I wonder if that is not being maintained now and/or what other systems they are using to deal with this quality control problem?

DR. VEATCH: If I could follow up on what Fran just said. We all seem to have gotten letters about classification. I thought that when this topic came up, there was going to be nobody sitting down, that you were all going to be in line.

My letter uses the word "havok on the shelves." Now, I think we would like to know if this is an overstatement and know just what some of these problems are. To an extent, some of this can sound like maybe it is isolated stuff. We really do need to know the extent.

I have one here that talks about changing the numbering of the County Business Patterns. Okay, now you are all saying yes. (laughter)

Why haven't you already been up there telling us this is a problem?

They have also got another title, significant features of fiscal federalism, which was changed. It didn't really cause havoc, it just -- everything is together the way it is supposed to be, it is just in a different place, evidently.

Some of these things, we would really like to hear from you all just how extensive some of these changes in classification are for you.

MR. HORDUSKY: I just had one comment to make about the County Business Pattern problems. I think it was an ill-timed move. If they would have started at the beginning of the next published year of County Business Patterns and let us know ahead.

Like, you could say, this class will be retired and/or whatever, to give us some warning that there is going to be a massive change in that particular agency's publication.

It is almost as bad as changing the number or the agency volume if it happens to move from one small area to another, like Public Health Reports, I guess, has changed I don't know how many times. If you try to bind them, your records well, look like chicken tracks.

MS. JACOB: I agree. I think that one of the problems with everybody complaining about this is that it seems to picky because we all have our own little special governmental finances. It is just that they took one perfectly good little system and they changed it into another system which is not as good.

That is very picky. I think the problem is letting us know, thinking it through, asking somebody. There is no point in going to all that work to make something that is no better than what they had before.

A PARTICIPANT: Barbara Smith, Skidmore College.

I know I had the same thing. I was sitting here thinking, it is so picky for me to get up with some shipping lists to show the particular problems, but I want to speak to the one which is a government employment series, which has come up.

On the introduction page it very clearly describes the series saying that the employment series consists of four reports. Under one class number we have, since they first putting out the series, shelved them together. The last thing we need now, is to have each one of these things given a separate class number so instead of having one check-in card, we will now have now have four check-in cards and have them arranged by these parts of the series. We want them to stand as a series.

When you make a change in the classification before the colon, I don't think you understand what this does to our local records. That means in County Business Patterns, instead of having C3.204: for all the states and the summary, if we are really going to make our records work we have to have 51 or 52 separate check in cards.

Nobody needs this, believe me. You have got to have somebody that you can talk to about this kind of classification change that is maintaining a depository library check in system or we are all going to go quietly crazy.

We are going quietly crazy. Where are we standing up? We are not. So, if you want -- we are going to go crazy, okay. I just loved the 3186 series. It is great. The P20's I know precisely what they are and I go get them. Now, apparently, every title in every one of these P20's, P23's and what have you, you are going to make into separate classifications. We are going to have to have 85 check in cards to deal with it and we don't need this.

They are done very nicely. They have their own numbers from the census. If anyone comes in and wants one of these things, we can get it in nothing flat. The idea was to help us, but ask us first, I guess, is the best thing I can say to that.

DR. VEATCH: I have a note here on Current Industrial Reports that they say is going to add a hundred new cards.

A PARTICIPANT: Barbara Smith, Skidmore College.

The Current Industrial Reports, we have sat in our library and read this thing until -- I can't decide if it is Sanskrit or what you are trying to say because you are not saying anything.

You are saying that we are taking that we are taking this out of the class, Current Industrial Reports, but you are not, you are making separate class numbers out of all of these different products. You are still calling them C3.148: with the same number. You are telling me that you are making all of these separate classes, but it is the same item number.

You have not done one single, solitary thing in that case, except confused us greatly.

MS. SMITH: If I could ask a question of GPO?

Is the rationale for the evolution of the classification scheme to simplify processing from your perspective, to put things in a machine-readable format? I think the major problem, as has been demonstrated, is the lack of communication between what we are doing and what you are doing.

MS. McLEAN: Illinois GODORT requested us --

MS. SMITH: Don't look at me when you say that.

MS. McLEAN: No, no. They requested us to give individual serial titles that were within series, like you have the bulletin series and you have four different serial titles, which they could not find to provide bibliographic access to their patrons, individual class numbers.

We wrote back and said, yes, we could do that, which is what we have been doing. It does provide better bibliographic control because you can now search on OCLC with the GN search and pull up the exact class and pull up the record.

Whereas when you have one of these things where you have a hundred lumped into one little thing, you can't search them and it takes a lot more time bibliographically.

MS. SMITH: Thank you.

A PARTICIPANT: Rachel VanWingen, Geogetown: I just want to repeat that I am going quietly crazy with these numbered series. The numbers are used as citations. When GPO pulls them out, makes a different class for each series within it, then it gives us another step. I had very personal experience with this when I was out of the room the other morning and the vice president for planning of the entire university was in. He wanted number 346 of series P60 and my student went to the shelf and it was not there, even though we had checked in about five numbers after it.

He checked on the shelf list and it was not checked in and he just assumed we had not received that number. It turns out it is now under C3.186/2, something like that.

This has happened with Current Fisheries Statistics, with the BLS bulletins, with -- you get the idea.

Once again, the rationale escapes me because you can go to the Monthly Catalog and look these up by title. You can look up -- I think it turned out to be money, income -- something like that.

You can look that up by title in the Monthly Catalog right now. So, the rationale escapes me.

A PARTICIPANT: Sandy Peterson, Yale University.

It dismays me that one group, constituency, could ask for something and this is the advisory body to the Public Printer, and they were not consulted, that represents more than just one particular group for a major policy change of this nature and the havoc that it is raising in libraries.

MS. HODUSKI: I think that you have to sort out cataloging versus classification. I believe what GODORT asked is that series, as far as cataloging goes, be identified. So when you went into the database or you had a serials record that you would know, for example, the County Business Patterns of Alabama.

There are people who select one particular state and they get it year after year after year and they have a cataloging record or make a cataloging record which I did when I cataloged all of my serials and the patron searches for it that way.

Now, basically, that is what GODORT asked for. I am not sure that they asked that there be a separate classification number, for example, on the BLS Bulletins. You can catalog a separate series and still have them all in the same class number. You don't have to do the two of them together. That may be where the confusion stands. I don't really remember who was on that GODORT committee, but I do remember many, many discussions about this. Basically, I see that as the difference.

I, personally, think that some of these examples, I believe that GPO is finally following their own classification manual and that they are properly structuring these classification numbers, putting the series in the right place before the colon and so on.

Actually, I would applaud them on the classification they have done. I think it is wonderful. Now, whether you wanted the new class numbers is beside the point, but the class numbers that they have done are beautiful.

MS. SMITH: Some of the problem, of course, is that we have never seen the Classification Manual so there is a lot confusion out in the field as to, why are these people doing these things.

I know, I have a staff person who said that she has gotten so tired of calling up, for instance, that she cannot even explain what it is that they are doing that is driving her crazy and I think that is probably across the board.

A PARTICIPANT: Steve Hayes, Notre Dame.

I think that, as Bernadine said, GPO got some instructions and interpreted it a little bit too far. Also, again, it is a problem that they are a processing institution. They are not a library. They don't see the end results over an extended period of time. They are not shelving these. They are not checking them in so, therefore, they do not see our problem from that particular end.

Alsc, I don't think that they see -- as a researcher I have got people that, indeed, they want to look at Alabama in the County Business Patterns, but they are also going to look in the same year for 15 other states, but they don't want to go from number, to number, to number to find the same 15 over and over again.

So, I think it is a good idea. I think that down the road they should have foreseen that this was going to have a major impact just in sheer numbers of classification changes that they were getting. They should have checked with, at least individual members on the Council, saying, this is what we want to do. Go look at your shelves, give us some immediate feedback. Should we do this before contacting you again, and get some librarians' feedback in terms of end result.

My staff is going crazy making tracings that ignore the classification changes. We are making a lot of local decisions that we shouldn't have to do, in terms of if we had been pre-asked.

MS. SMITH: Are there other comments from anybody on this topic? I think the problem is well documented at this point.

Are there other bibliographic control issues anyone would like to bring up, either from the Council or from the audience that we have not touched upon?

MS. EISENBEIS: Diane, one thing was in my correspondence was some of the classification problems with the maps. I wondered how you are dealing with the maps in cataloging and classification now that Gil is gone?

MS. McLEAN: Gil's staff has been detailed, the cataloging personnel have been detailed to Marian MacGilvray and the classification personnel have been detailed to Jorge Ponce.

MS. EISENBEIS: How do you handle the classification and cataloging of the maps? Some of the classifications, I think are confusing.

MS. McLEAN: Vi Morehouse classifies some of the maps. She is detailed to Marian. Whatever comes through conventionally is classified by the classifiers who have been classifying it for years.

MS. SMITH: Are there any other bibliographic control issues?

A PARTICIPANT: Bill LaBissoniere. We just got that new list of Inactive or Discontinued Items and I feel it would be much more useful if it were arranged by class stem number to item number or at least add stem to item rather than having to go to an item number.

As it is now, someone comes to you with a title. You have it in hand, you have the stem in front of you and then you have to go look up the item number and then you go to the item list. That would be a better one step product if you could add the class stem number so we could go right to it and say this thing is discontinued or inactive.

The other problem is, it does not really tell you which it is. I think it would be helpful if you stated directly, discontinued. Apparently, we don't really know, for sure, is one of the problems, but where we do know I think we should put it down, "This has been discontinued as of -- ", I don't think that information is on there presently. I think thatk product could be improoved.

MS. SMITH: Anything else?

Maps, Kathleen, you said you had something else to talk about?

MS. EISENBEIS: One of them was classification.

MS. SMITH: Is that it, then?

MS. EISENBEIS: The other was user aids.

MS. SMITH: So, we have pretty much touched on that. Okay, fine.

Great, we will move on to another topic completely. Acquisition issues. Does anyone on Council wish to discuss, at this hour, the specificity of item numbers, List of Classes or any of that?

MS. TULIS: I just have one comment.

I have been seeing more and more corrections coming through on the shipping lists where they have changed the class number and then you will get a comment that no item number has been established for this class yet.

My concern is: When are those item numbers coming? I talked to Barbara a little bit about it this morning and the assumption is that if it was sent under an old item number that is the item number it is probably going to be added to.

In some instances, I have one in particular, where the items was originally sent under two class numbers, two items numbers, and was given a third class number of which there is nothing, right now, under that stem.

Is that going to be surveyed at some point? I am just really worried that we are never going to get a notification saying what the item number is that belongs with that class number.

I have gotten pages and pages of the corrections where that has been done. It bothers me. I don't know why the item number is not established right then and there.

MS. SMITH: Can you respond to that, Mark?

MR. SCULLY: I really can't add much to what Barbara Appel may have told you. I would appreciate having a copy of those pages. I would like to take it up with Barbara and hear it from her and then report back tomorrow afternoon.

MS. JACOB: Also, it is not just -- that is the thing about these little picky things. This is much wider. I mean, this is going on, she has got some examples, but there are more of them. I mean, it is -- I sent in -- it is so picky, I shouldn't even tell it, but I will give her a copy of what I got. It is just a sample.

MS. CROSS: Mark, I gave you copies of the letters that I had received and I included some from some of the other council members. Will your staff be looking at those, and will there be some sort of a response or should I go ahead and respond to these people and say that you are looking into it? How do you handle these? Will you handle them as if you got a letter diretly to you?

MR. SCULLY: We could respond to them in any way you like. We could respond directly and drop you a copy or we could forward a response to you. As you like.

MS. CROSS: I would just like to know that the individual who had the concern will get a reply.

MR. SCULLY: Let us respond and then we will drop you a copy. That way, it makes it easy for you and we satisfy the problem.

MS. SMITH: Are there any other comments on this?

(No response)

MS. SMITH: Rainchecks was another issue that was proposed to us. Is there anyone on the council who wishes to discuss rainchecks?

MS. JACOB: One thing I want to know and I should have found out in the tour we had yesterday, it is just my stupidity, but where are the bulk of the decisions made about what item a new publication comes under when it is ordered? Is it in LPS or is it in some other place?

It sounds from what I have read here, to be in Customer Services. How do they make these decisions? This has a lot to do with the shortages.

MS. SMITH: Mark, can you answer that?

MR. SCULLY: Could you go over that again?

MS. SMITH: Who makes the decision, basically, of what is going to be rainchecked?

MS. JACOB: No, who makes the decision on how much to order? Are they made here or are they made in Customer Services?

MR. SCULLY: It depends where the publication originates. There are three possible locations, I should say four, within the GPO.

One would be the Regional Printing Procurement Offices in the field. Now, they don't make the decision. What they do is send a copy of the agency's request for printing by telefacsimile to the room just below us here.

Then we would make a decision on the item number and the quantity from that.

MS. JACOB: So, you make that decision from seeing what they send you.

MR. SCULLY: We make that decision, something that is printed in the regions around the country, fourteen regions. We make a decision remotely, by a telefacsimile copy.

MS. JACOB: So, you know title, number of pages --

MR. SCULLY: No, that is a real problem area because very often the data we receive are insufficient. It will state a title but not the fact that it is a series, or it won't be complete enough for us to make an intelligent, accurate decision.

We are working on that. That is a very tough nut to crack.

MS. JACOB: What percentage is that of the --

MR. SCULLY: That is the minority. We are not getting all that much from the regions. Most of the stuff comes through GPO Customer Service on the 8th floor in this building. They make that decision up there using our guidelines.

In my presentation this morning, I mentioned the fact that we had had this task force this past summer and the recommendations that we will implement immediately are training and our Classification Manual and procedures for assigning it.

In other words, to instruct them, bring them up to date and have them make better decisions on the publications that come across.

Secondly, we are going to put one of Barbara Appel's people, possibly Phil Ziegler or one his acquisitions people, actually up there two hours a day, to work with those folks up in GPO Customer Service and go over, not 100 percent, but the ones they are not dead certain of.

MS. JACOB: What kind of tools do they have? Nobody has a collection of documents to look at, that is what I understand, but --

MR. SCULLY: As often as not they do, up there. They have at least a galley copy, if not --

MS. JACOB: Oh, so they actually have --

MR. SCULLY: They do have a publication.

MS. JACOB: They don't have a collection of former ones to see whether something goes in a series?

MR. SCULLY: No, they are a processing shop. They are not any kind of a collection or a library. They call it as they see it as it comes across.

I am hoping, by placing our person up there, one of our acquisitions technicians, that we will provide that kind of continuity so if the decision cannot be made by looking at the piece, then that person will bring it down and run it against our files or make a phone call to LPS and say, hey, check the shelf list on this, but to have some kind of contact, communication, that is actively going on between the

Customer Service and the GPO so that we can really do an advance investigation and check on that.

Once the quantity goes in, we are stuck. If it is short or if it is over, it is too late to recall it. It goes to press and we get the amount that we ordered. So, the time to really do the research is at the front end before you put that quantity on the order for printing.

The area of least problem, I mentioned two, the third one would be Congressional printing. All of those are pre-set. We have relatively few difficulties with Congressional printing in-house here.

Then the fourth category would be agencies themselves, things that are printed on waiver or otherwise. Through the -- by the agencies and not by GPO. That is a whole different game there. Because it means going out and obtaining the -- the thing you are talking about is fugitive documents, really, more than shortages.

Those are the four prime sources of publications.

MS. JACOB: But, the Customer Services does very often have an actual proof of the document to go on?

MR. SCULLY: Yes, they tell me that.

MS. TULIS: Since you mentioned Congressional publications being done in-house, I will bring up the fact that there are more and more things we are not getting, House reports, House documents, and when I submit a claim, it comes back "out of print."

I have an entire folder of them that I have kept for you, I am sorry to say. Even my regional has had trouble with that. He has gotten the microfiche, but he has not gotten the paper when he has submitted a claim. The same thing has happened to him.

One thing I am going to suggest, but I still don't see why this problem arises in the first place, since you are supposed to have an exact number of how many copies you need to get or have printed initially, is that in that instance, since they are already filmed, there is a microfilm master for the House report, that if they can't fill it with paper, at least fill it with microfiche.

I would still like to know why the paper is coming back "out of print"?

MR. SCULLY: The only case from your regional that I am aware of recently was the letter we got about a month ago on the Serial Set items. We took care of that. I think we responded within two days and provided every document that he had requested.

MS. TULIS: You did and you were very good on that.

I am talking now about ones that are just mine. I can write to the committee or the House Document Room and get a copy.

MR. SCULLY: Let's go over those with Barbara Appel and Carla Spence. I would want to talk with our specialists and see what we can do here. It might be indicative of a broader problem, and it might be helpful to us. Let's look at that with Barbara.

MS. EISENBEIS: Relative to that, we ordered Federal Register on microfiche and it came back "out-of-print."

MR. SCULLY: The daily register?

MS. EISENBEIS: Federal Register. I grant you it was a 1984, but it came back out of print.

It was an order that we placed for microfiche Federal Register and it came back "out of print." Can you imagine?

MR. SCULLY: I do know that on Price List 36 there is a code that tells which recent issues are available on a piece-by-piece sale basis, the current four or six issues, it is in there.

MS. EISENBEIS: Fine.

MR. SCULLY: That is their policy and they establish that for every subscription item.

MS. EISENBEIS: If I, as a depository, lose some of my issues, and I can't replace them with paper, my option is to try to replace them in fiche.

If I can't replace them in fiche from sales, how would you suggest that I get them?

MR. SCULLY: Jay Young will be here tomorrow talking about the on-demand sales program. Let's way until we hear what Jay has to say about the on-demand sales program and then if the problem cannot be resolved that way, then we will look beyond.

MS. SMITH: Mark, if I may ask a question.

It seems to me from the past that the primary thrust of the rainchecks was with the move from Alexandria to here, yet we are still getting the rainchecks. Is this now becoming an LPS policy to raincheck?

MR. SCULLY: It is our policy. It has been our policy.

MS. SMITH: It was presented last year in the light of the move, primarily as a stop-gap measure.

MR. SCULLY: Oh, I don't think that that was ever the intent. I can only say that decision was made and we implemented it. I don't see any clamor within GPO to rescind it.

MS. SMITH: The second question is: Based on that I went back and did some analysis of how many rainchecks we have received and how many have been filled.

There is a substantial proportion that have not been filled over the year. We still have fifty percent from last October. When will you all bite the bullet, basically and tell us that we are not going to get it. Are you going to let us keep piling up these rainchecks?

MR. SCULLY: As soon as we get an answer from our service department.

MS. SMITH: So, we are going to keep piling up these lists?

MR. SCULLY: Let me say this, I will harass them at least as much as the librarians harass me. I can promise you that.

MR. HORDUSKY: This is sort of a raincheck type problem, but when GPO did their bit on this automated mailing system and they dropped the regionals for Federal Register and Congressional Record, we have not received any of the microfiche on that.

I can do without the paper --

MR. SCULLY: You mean, you subscription was dropped when the change over was made?

MR. HORDUSKY: Oh, yes. All fifty regionals were completely lopped off. I haven't got any microfiche to cover that time period. I don't have the paper copy. I don't have the microfiche. I have people screaming at my door for it. When do you expect to --

A PARTICIPANT: Barbara Appel, GPO: The regionals were temporarily wiped out.

MR. HORDUSKY: For about a two week period.

A PARTICIPANT: Barbara Appel, GPO: We are trying to acquire those. I don't know the current status on each of those items, but we will be glad to get back to you on that.

MR. SCULLY: Here is our announcement to regional librarians saying there was a snafu on the computer interface hookup and the problem has been fixed, but some issues were missed during the interim.

Did you get this notice?

MR. HORDUSKY: Yes.

MR. SCULLY: That is why you are so pleased.

MR. HORDUSKY: It saves a little bit of space, but --

MR. SCULLY: We are always willing to do favors like that, Clyde. (laughter)

MR. HORDUSKY: So, this is fixed now?

MR SCULLY: Yes, but there may still be outstanding editions. So, we are just going to have to do double duty and fulfill those claims, that's all. It seems to me --it is our system and we have to deliver the goods.

A PARTICIPANT: Lois Mills, Western Illinois University.

I have not heard it mentioned yet, in this meeting, but I have heard a number of people over lunch and in the bar and so on, talk about how many duplicates they have gotten.

Then somebody else talks about how many rainchecks they have gotten. I wonder if there is some kind of connection between the two. Some of us watched the people with the lighted bins. They are great, but I don't know how those people keep track of where they have been. That might be part of the problem because some of them don't seem to have any specific route that they follow. They stop in the middle of one and start again someplace else.

This could be the reason we get -- it is not the reason we get rainchecks, but it is the reason that people get duplicates. It has never been clear until today or yesterday that the GPO wanted those sent back to them.

So, people who got duplicates, we just count it as a copy two, and keep it. It is generally something that is going to disappear and then maybe we have one copy.

If it was made clear that duplicates should be sent back and they went to a place where the rainchecks also go, maybe there could be a connection made.

MS. SMITH: Thank you for that suggestion, Lois.

MR. SCULLY: I have another news alert from Mr. Covington, our distribution chief. He informs me that he is collecting all of these publications, Business America, Commerce Business Daily, Daily Weather Maps and so forth that we announced that the regionals had not gotten because of that computer hookup. You will get those automatically; regionals need not claim those.

Selectives, on the other hand, should claim them. Selectives would have been affected for another reason that we would not know about, so do claim if you are a selective. Regionals, you will get them automatically.

MS. SMITH: Last comment, Jim?

DR. VEATCH: Well, maybe next to the last. I wanted to make sure that Mark heard what Lois said. Did you catch that?

MR. SCULLY: No, I didn't.

DR. VEATCH: I was afraid of that.

I think it is an especially good point. Let me throw mine in here too, before she comes back up to reiterate this.

You made the point several times that you are getting a lot of spurious claims, false claims, people claiming things that they are not entitled to. You have never given us any idea just how big that problem is, but I am wondering about what the workflow actually is. If someone sends in a claim, do you just automatically pack it up and ship it without checking to see they are entitled to it?

MR. SCULLY: We don't have the staff to do a hundred percent verification of claims. We do it on a sampling basis and even that has shown up to indicate a good number of false claims, but no. There is no way, with our current staffing. Again, it is one of those things that would detract from our normal production operations and I don't think that is what any of us want. We do it on a sampling basis and go with that.

DR. VEATCH: I would like to have Lois reiterate, if she would.

MS. TULIS: Could I just touch on that before we leave? I talked to Colleen Davis about that this morning and she was saying, obviously, if someone submits an entire shipping list with everything circled she is going to double check on that and check to make sure that that library is, indeed, entitled to getting all of those things. If it is one or two items off a shipping list, then no it is probably not going to get caught unless as Mark said, on a sampling basis. But, if it is a large number being claimed, then yes it will get checked.

MR. SCULLY: I can tell you of a case just last week. I returned eight claim requests to the supervisor of the librarian. The supervisor in LPS had assured me -- this is one of our chronic offenders -- my supervisor here at LPS had personally checked and verified that those copies had been in those shipments as they were sealed. So, we know for certain -- and they all happened to be CFR's, so -- you know. I think it speaks for itself.

I returned it with a letter to the librarian's supervisor as dishonored claims. That is one thing we have done. The folks on the West Coast are going to get cut out of the action. They are going to get out-of-prints if we allow people to do these things. We only order twenty copies over for claims and paper. If people on the East Coast say, gee, I want one of those back in acquisitions as well as reference and they claim it, sorry California and Oregon.

That is, it seems to me that we have to police that. We have a responsibility to those libraries who are at a disadvantage in this way.

MS. EISENBEIS: Lois are you going to repeat that?

MS. MILLS: No, I think everyone heard me except Mark.

MS. SMITH: Somebody can tell Mark what she said.

MS. EISENBEIS: I hear a lot about the claims from your point of view, Mark. But, from my point of view, I am running into problems I have never had before. Not only is it out-of-print, but I get returns where the first one is filled, but then they don't look at the rest of them on the sheet.

MR. SCULLY: You circle more than one item on the sheet and they only respond to one?

MS. EISENBEIS: Right or they send the wrong one.

Now, you have personally received a letter from me that followed up on one to show you why that is frustrating. You responded by sending me the ones I claimed, but out of the four I only got two right and two wrong and a double on one. So, your hit rate was real low and I noticed you didn't respond to me that.

MR. SCULLY: Well, a baseball player who bats five hundred is --

MS. EISENBEIS: You know that is not funny.

(laughter)

MS. EISENBEIS: I don't think I am alone. I have mentioned that. I don't think it is an isolated problem. I am getting a little worn down today listening to the problem that you have of unjustified claims. We have other problems with claims that I don't understand.

MR. SCULLY: I think we need to step up policing on both sides of the fence.

MS. SMITH: It is now 5:00 o'clock and I think it is definitely time to finish.

A PARTICIPANT: I was going to speak for Lois. I think someone should tell Mark that many libraries receive copies they did not request and there has been no process or standard procedure for them in dealing with those copies.

If there is a relationship between those copies and the people who get "out of print" on claims, we ought to have a system for returning them.

MS. SMITH: Before we all disappear, if you have other acquisition issues that you would like council to discuss, please talk to somebody and let us know so we can add them to our list.

Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 5:05 o'clock, p.m., the meeting was adjourned to reconvene at 8:30 a.m. on October 17, 1985, in the same place.)